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Sammenfatning

Afhandlingen beskæftiger sig med risikostyringskonceptet Enterprise Risk Management (ERM), der fra omkring årtusindeskiftet e r advokeret som en ledelsesteknologi, der kan bidrage til erhvervs virksomheders værdiskabelse. Tanken om at kunne kontrollere eller styre risiko er ikke ny. Statistikkenes og sandsynlighedsregningens udvikling ligger flere århundreder tilbage, og på store homogene populationer har man kunnet tilknytte sandsynligheder for at givne hændelser vil indtræffe i fremtiden. Når s andsynligheden tilknyttes konsekvens, har vi i den klassiske risikostyrings tankesæt omformet usikkerhed til en forudsigelig risiko. De n kobling udnyttes mange steder, f.eks. er det selve grundlaget for et forsikringsselskabs forretningsmodel. I den konceptuelle tankegang bag ERM forlades det rationelle og objektspecifikke fundament, der kendetegner ovennævnte klassiske risikostyring.

ERM-paradigmets grundtanke er, at en virksomheds samlede risikoeksponering kan anskues og håndteres som en portefølje i en kontinuerlig proces, der integreres i virksomhedens strategiske beslutninger. Den strategiske kobling betyder, at vi bevæger os ind i unikke relationer, hvortil der ikke eksisterer historisk evidens for udfaldsrummet.

Det konceptuelle spring og de praksisrelaterede konsekvenser, der kendetegner forskellene mellem klassisk risikostyring og ERM, er afhandlingens fokus. Forskningsprojektet har strakt sig over mere end 12 år, og det har givet en sjælden mulighed for at følge en moderne ledelsesteknologis livscyklus fra conceptualisering over praksisimplikationer frem til evaluering af konceptets værdi og fremtid.

Afhandlingens kerne er 4 artikler, der hver især søger at belyse et af projektets 3 forskningsspørgsmål, der 1) undersøger koncepternes ledelsesmæssige og organisatoriske orientering, 2) undersøger drivkræfter og motiver for virksomheders adoption af ERM som ledelsesteknologi, og 3) søger indsigt i udfordringer og problematikker, som virksomheder støder på i anvendelsen af ERM -konceptet.

Artiklerne er udarbejdet successivt gennem projektets langstrakte forløb, og afspejler derfor progressionen i konceptuel udvikling og praksisudfordringer, men også i min egen erkendelse.
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Executive Summary:

This thesis reflects on refugee camps as spaces of organizing and investigates the politics, which are enacted and produced through such. Refugee camps have largely been neglected as sides and sites of organizing within recent studies of organization. This thesis therefore seeks to situate sites of organizing such as refugee camps - which literally are placed at the margins, both of space as well as of organizational discourses - at the centre.

The thesis draws on the work of Giorgio Agamben and his reflections on the relations between sovereign power and naked life. By doing so, it opens the field of organization studies to different sites of organizing and seeks to introduce refugee camps as spaces and legal entities, which may be paradigmatic for our times. While emphasizing a spatial reading of Agamben’s work, the thesis seeks to further investigate the organization of space(s) as central for understanding the politics of refugee camps. Space then, is understood as both socially producing and produced, as a site of struggle and contestation: Whereas homogeneity of spatial use and space itself is often obtained and enforced, space offers itself as analytic lens, through which everyday struggles can be observed and described. Drawing on field work and material from two refugee camps in Sub-Saharan Africa, the thesis then analyses these specific camps through a spatial triad of lived, perceived and conceived spaces, arguing that a differentiation of spaces is embedded in the attempts of organizing of one. Based on a post-foundational understanding of politics, the thesis then considers refugee camps as sites of continuous struggle between temporality and permanence, order and disorder, localization and centering, humanitarianism and governance, and power and resistance. Whilst refugee camps are highly organized places, which seek to render homogeneity and seek to distinguish between inside and outside, they also constantly produce inherent ruptures and paradoxes, which in turn produce the possibilities of an emancipatory
politics for camp inhabitants, beyond and through their inscription as refugees.
Dansk Resumé:

The Politics of Organizing Refugee Camps

emancipatoriske politik for lejrens væsener, der transcenderer og overskrider deres subjektrolle som flygtning.
The Politics of Organizing Refugee Camps

Table of Content:

1 Introduction, or Munich: 2013  
8

2 Supplication and the Order  
16
2.1 Fugatus ante portas  
18
2.2 Asylum seeker, entrepreneur, political hero and villain – on the complexity of refugee figures  
25
2.3 The organization of the mobile, unknown other  
35

3 The Naked and the Sovereign  
49
3.1 On the margins and at the core of organizations  
53
3.2 The Organization of Homo Sacri  
57
3.3 The Production of the State and the Sovereign  
60
3.4 On the notion of the camp  
65

4 The Space and its Bodies  
73
4.1 Spatializing Organizations  
76
4.2 The Social Production of Space and the Everyday  
81
4.3 Organizing Space: On perceived, conceived and lived Spaces  
87
4.4 Abstract Space  
91
4.5 Spatializing the body and its politics  
97

5 Methodologies  
100
5.1 Theorizing Methodology: The Politics of Researching Refugee Camps
106
5.2 Collecting empirical material
114

6 Analyzing Camps
125
6.1 Orderings: conceived space
127
6.2 Orderings: perceived space
139
6.3 Orderings: lived space
149
6.4 Towards Politics of Contingent Foundations
158

7 Producing Paradoxes and the Possibilities of Politics
159

8 Epilogue, or: Athens 486 BC
190

Bibliography
198
1 Introduction

In October 2013 “Reise ans Ende der Nacht” (Journey to the End of the Night) premiered at the Residenztheater in Munich. The highly acclaimed play, a journey into the heart of darkness of western civilization, was directed by Frank Castorf, based on the book ‘Voyage au bout de la nuit’ by Louis-Ferdinand Céline from 1932. Aleksander Denic produced the stage design. It takes us, the spectator, the viewer, the audience (the reader?), into a village, supposedly the African village as the place of the spectacle on and to which Castorf has reduced Céline's tour through the modern world and its scenes ranging from the battle grounds of World War I, to Paris, to Africa, to North America. We see a bar and a room, there is a balcony and then, there is a gate, separating us from what is happening behind the gate, a double exclusion next to the stage and the viewers seats. In the background of the stage, we see a screen on which, typical for Castorf plays, pre-produced clips and scenes from backstage are live-screened, the actors walking and acting behind the stage, an area most often invisible for the spectators. And yet this
view is also partly blocked, interrupted by the gate; we can only see what remains otherwise hidden through its frame and writing. The gate reminds us of, and is aesthetically and emotionally linked to, the infamous entrance gate of Auschwitz I concentration and extermination camp. Two wooden, black and white polls hold a metal frame with a Swung. But instead of the Auschwitz lines "Arbeit macht frei" (work sets you free), we read something else. Instead of the misused and profaned slogan of the German workers movement - which the SS has made use of not only in Auschwitz but also numerous other concentration camps playing fast and loose with the tragedy that no concentration camp inmate has ever been set free due to good, hard work or diligence as Sofsky reminds us (2000: 26) - we encounter the slogan of the French revolution 1789: Liberté, Égalité, Fraternité. The slogan of the French revolution was also included in the constitution of France's Fifth Republic, a phrase, widely distributed in the era of enlightenment, and which stands for a break with a sovereign power marked by the reign of a king and a distribution of political power to the people. It works, evidently, as a linguistic milestone and metaphor for the changing nature of the distribution of state power and its influence over its citizens, as well as for the possibility for wider political influence. It was first written on the walls and streets of Paris and then carried throughout France, occupying, shaping and politically redistributing the space belonging to the reign of the king but being overtaken by the people.

So the boundaries of Denic' village are marked by, maybe the most notable and recognizable, symbol of a space of terror and death, while the slogan it carries has been this linguistic and metaphorical milestone in the establishment of modern western democracies and the defiance of absolute sovereign power, reshaping the relationship between the citizens and the state. But both these notions hint at the idea of the nomos the refugee camps presents: the nomos as a terminology between Ortung and Ordnung as Carl Schmitt worked out. It is open in the way that it constitutes itself between both these terms, and closed as it marks a difference to its surroundings: As a spatial entity, separated and yet being part of, excluded and included as legal frame, an ordering that deconstructs and constructs, it
defines and breaks up the relationship between those who are fleeing and the legal entity where they are seeking refuge.

The following chapter seeks to take a step back from our first impression of the meaning of Aleksander Denic´ stage design and its use of the aesthetics of Auschwitz, as well as its recalling Delacroix’s painting ‘La Liberté guidant le peuple’, which, even though painted as a portrait of the July revolution 41 years later, could serve as an iconographic representation of the famous slogan of the French revolution. Yet, this theatre stage we encounter here at the beginning, is a nod to what is about to follow in a double sense: Firstly to the writing and the argument of this thesis and to the function of it, which also is one of being a gate, allowing for a glimpse and an recording, which is there in the background, on the margins. Secondly, it hints at the complexity of discussing refugee camps as spaces of organizing, full of contradictions and ruptures, symbols, sounds, stories and voices which contradict one another and are yet entangled in and through the production of camps. I will return, to these notions and ideas throughout the following text and shape an argument around and through such complexities. To reduce them for the moment, I will, in the following, outline the structure of the thesis and how the argument is being structured.

We are then standing at the gates in manifold ways at this point: One may be able to sense, what there is to come: a textual discussion of the ‘Politics of organizing refugee camps’. And just like the camps this text seeks to reflect, the text itself should be treated spatially, as a space, as a room to manoeuvre around, to get lost and find new ways out. This then is a beginning of a journey, and since a story needs a beginning we might start at the gate, outside still, but sensing, getting a feeling for the inside, yet not sure what there is, but able to sense the messiness, the complexities of what there is to come. A gate indeed is needed and it is needed right here at the beginning, because it hinds, reminds us of a separation of an ‘outside’ and an ‘inside’ and what may be in-between, notions which will reappear and structure the discussion which is about to begin. These are, already here, quite spatial terms, yet maybe not so much socially enacted ones.
The Politics of Organizing Refugee Camps

The title then presents another gate, a first way of feeling, sensing of what there is to come, already a certain structure of the text to follow in itself: Writing and thinking about the ‘Politics of Organizing Refugee Camps’ opens towards, uses and aims for certain terms which are already inscribed in the title and which will guide but also question the present thesis throughout its arguments:

The predispositions, roughly sketched at this moment hint at an understanding of politics as contingent, an understanding within which the other is always potentially possible, an understanding which presupposes a potential and actual plurality of politics and which it mirrors for a pluralities of reasons. A plurality of reasons allows us to think the actual space of the camp as being constituted by but also different from the notions of security and government we have come across in the opening quote: Politics may be opposed to the Political, one might be able to say, maybe even more so: it is an ontological necessity of the Political to understand yet be different from the Politics.

Organization in the light of this thesis is indeed understood as something which “indexes more than the structure that lift us out of ‘bare life’“(Jones & Munro, 2005: 1), but as potentially (and actually) bringing and producing the ‘bare life’ upon us. Refugee camps may be – at first sight – the easiest term to grasp, a term which evokes images, ideas – a wide range of terminologies: Tents, suffering, help, oppressed and relieved, medical care, schools, food supply and shelter, also violence, boredom, fences and gates. The Plural used here points not only at two actual camps which are at the core of the ethnographic investigation of such spaces within this thesis, Buduburam in Ghana and Oru in Nigeria, but also hints at the claim to be made about the politics involved in the ongoing production of camps on a general level, describing certain organizational logics, which are embedded and evoked through the set-up of such camps.

The thesis has seven chapters: Following this introduction, Chapter 2 Supplication and the Order examines the topic of (forced) migration plays a decisive role, as well as the variety of academic discourses which concern and shape our thinking of the organization of refugee camps. Specifically the
chapter examines the legal and political attempts of state and non-state actors to cope and organize (forced) migration and fleeing. Furthermore, this chapter seeks to give an overview over some of the most prominent forms of social figures, through and in which refugees are inscribed and which are decisive for the way political solutions for refugees are being shaped. Such investigation is needed, for it describes the attempts and ways through which migration is being organized linguistically and then actually and politically. This leads to a discussion of the organization of the mobile, unknown other, which then gives way to a focus on camps as spaces of organizing that hints at an opening for investigating the politics of such. The chapter not only serves as an introduction to the field itself and the current state of research, but also points to the ground which it then intends to leave. Reflecting the epistemological security of the landscape of refugee/migration/organization studies, it uses this security to reach for the unknown or to think the known differently in the hope of allowing for a another way of entering, perceiving and understanding the field. The chapter outlines what there is, but its purpose for the thesis originates as an opening away from the known, to what is not there yet. Finally, the chapter offers an insight into my motivation to write this thesis, pointing also at the politics of such an undertaking, and maybe pointing out the obvious: that there have been other gates than the one we are standing at right now, and that the beginning we are encountering here might as well be described as a middle.

Following these attempts to situate the text, Chapter 3 The Naked and the Sovereign build on this by discussing the work of Giorgio Agamben, most notably his seminal texts and extensive work on and around the Homo Sacer and questions of sovereign power. Agamben is being presented as one thinker largely neglected by studies of organization, or, at least, underrepresented. I am trying to point out the importance of understanding his seminal work for the study and understanding of organization and the effects of the politics of such. In order to do so, I examine central concepts of his work, which lay a foundation in understanding the space and politics of camps.
On this basis, Chapter 4 The Space and its Bodies provides an in-depth discussion of space as social product, both as socially produced and producing: The notion of space does not only serve as “a fundamental metaphor in socio-political thought” (Stavrakakis: 2011: 301) in general, but also, within this thesis which, as we have seen from the beginning onwards, could not be written without pointing at an ‘outside’ and ‘inside’, which then hints at a spatial reading (in an indeed also metaphorical sense) of the whole text itself. Space, furthermore, is a central concept insofar as it connects and enables a dialogue between the aforementioned foundations in the work of Agamben (and an emphasis on a reading of his work, which focuses on the spatial aspect of it), method assemblages and methodological considerations and a philosophical, partly historicized, endeavour to think camp and body, and the legal and political notions linking the two. Space in this regard not only serves conceptually, but also as a mode of thinking, a way to use all senses, hence “rediscovering their richness and meaning” (Lefebvre, 1966/1968: 5).

With that, Chapter 5 Methodologies discusses the methodological background of the text. It reflects the methods used when encountering refugee camps in Sub-Saharan Africa, describes the sites under investigation and ties the question of methods to the narratives and theoretical reflections which guide the thesis. Under discussion are not only questions of “how” research was carried out, but even more so: “why” and hence laying the basis for the analyses, but also engaging into a discussion of the politics of researches itself. An investigation of the methods, or maybe method assemblages, which lay the ground for what there is to come in constructing it, is necessary for it "detects, resonates with and amplifies particular patterns of relations in the excessive and overwhelming fluxes of the real" (Law, 2004: 14). It also opens for a discussion of the possibilities and limitations of this project, understanding its empirical material standing in a “interpretative relationship to the world it creates” (Denzin, 2003: 88) and therefore laying the ground for the following chapter.
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Chapter 6 Analyzing Camps follows the claim that “when institutional (academic) knowledge sets itself up above the lived experience, just as the state sets itself above everyday life, catastrophe is in the offing. Catastrophe is indeed already upon us.” (Lefebvre, 1991/1974: 451). The lived experiences, notions, voices of the everyday - and the everyday itself - are therefore presented in short vignettes, photos and quotes, ordered alongside and through the spatial reading chapter 4 has provided. The scenes and snapshots from the fieldwork at Buduburam refugee camp in Ghana and Oru refugee camp in Nigeria are organized in a scenic way which then sets up the analysis.

On this basis, the scenes of the camps are used in Chapter 7 Producing Paradoxes and the Possibilities of Politics to link the previous discussion of space and a theoretization of the camp as nomos of modernity. A topological reading of (refugee) camps and its implications on a manifold politics of organizations guides this chapter. This chapter therefore engages in a reflection of the relations between politics and space; between power and resistance, temporality and permanence, humanitarianism and governance, order and localization as well as order and disorder. It therefore seeks to outline the logics of the politics of organizing refugee camps on the basis of the previous chapters and, through the cases of the two camps, the ruptures to these which are embedded in the production of the camp and essential in the organization of camps and the “production of spatialities of sovereign power” (Ek, 2006: 377) and its implications for the political subject and the notion and (political) possibility for a community to establish itself in such settings.

This thesis then seeks to point towards a discussion of the notion of the camp as essential in an analyses of (spaces of) organizing, and does so during a period which may be described as marked by the “return of the camp” (Huysmans, 2008). In light of such times, Chapter 8 Epilogue, or: Athens, 468 BC reflects on the limitations and possibilities and the politics which may arise out of these settings, which can point to a new culture of the socio-political, of the possibilities to emerge and organize in such settings and surroundings, spaces which at first sight do not allow for such
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developments. This final chapter of the thesis summarizes the results and tries to point towards metamorphoses of the camp; different forms of organizing through which the logics which have been outlined in chapter 6 come into being, again leaving the seemingly solid ground of knowledge and developing further ideas for research. It will conclude by discussing the claim for the urgency for researchers to engage with the space and politics of the camp.

The thesis does not seek to offer a ready-made solution to the complexities how refugee camps and settlements organize themselves and produce ongoing politics themselves.. What is at stake, rather, is a discussion of the logics of the production of such spaces. This indeed might have practical implications, or at least offers a translation of the findings back into the real world, the everyday, into lived experiences. What it allows for is at least a dialogue between the spaces and the thinking of those spaces, a talking within and towards another and yet mirroring my hope to add to another notion of the ‘outside’ and the ‘inside’ and the in-between: to open up for new assessments of their relations in manifold ways: as theory and empirics, as spaces and bodies, as politics and organizing. In the end, I hope to contribute an opening upon these discussions which are taking place on different levels of methodology, practice and theory, hence: not creating a mirror to the world, but helping to open a field (James & Munro, 2005: 10).
2 Supplication and the Order

Commenting on the mass arrival of refugees in Europe during the summer of 2015 Elfriede Jelinek, the Austrian Literature Nobel prize winner, made the simple point that human beings are not a product and they do not remain where they ought to remain. Struggle, potentially resistance, is embedded in their leaving and arrival:

"It is long ago, the conquering of the world as image, for image means manufacturing. Humans though are not manufactured and they do not stay where they are put. They fight for their position and this is not a position, as they imagine it, but it simply who they are. They gave up to give their being a measure, for the measure is not exhausted yet." (Jelinek, 2012; own translation)

This short passage stands at the beginning of her text “Die Schutzbefohlenen” (those ordered to safety), a reference to the classic Greek Aeschylus play "The Suppliants", to which I will return at the end of this text (in the German translation: “Die Schutzflehenden“, those supplying for safety). The difference Jelinek is establishing here through the phonetic similarity between the titles (and indeed: the content of the drama and her text) is marked by the exchange of the last word of the title: While Aeschylus lets the fifty daughters of Danaus supplicate for safety, Jelinek's nameless masses are ordered to safety. And this ordering, this organizing also includes its resistance and its opposition, as Robert Walser (1985: 105; own translation) reminds us: “Not being allowed to cry for example, increases the need to cry [...] All that is forbidden, lives in hundred different ways; therefore, what should be dead, lives its life only more vividly": The

---

organization of those seeking, begging, demanding safety (in all its manifold complexity: food, shelter, rights, work, income) and its spatial organization is the concern of this thesis.

Writing on and thinking the politics of organizing refugee camps can be and has been undertaken from a variety of different angles: legal studies of rights, management studies of camp logistics and human resource management, sociological investigations of cultural tensions and gender structures, geographies of camp organization and studies of the history of fleeing and flight. The following chapter situates the thesis within this broad and moving field of study, specifically within studies of organization. It begins with descriptions of refugees and the ways nation-states, international, supra-national and non-governmental organizations try to come to terms with their presence. It then analyzes the ‘figure’ of the refugee and seeks to draw a typology of the social figure the refugee presents today and the often-contradictory notions which have been inscribed into the figure over the last century.
2.1 Fugatus ante portas

Shocking images of drowned Syrian boy show tragic plight of refugees
Young boy found lying face-down on a beach near Turkish resort of Bodrum
was one of at least 12 Syrians who drowned attempting to reach Greece
(Smith: 2015)

"Refugee crisis: what can you do to help?
From donating to a charity to volunteering – here is a guide to some of the
practical ways that individuals can contribute"
(Weaver: 2015)

Sweden and Denmark crack down on refugees at borders
Danes step up controls at German border after Swedish move to impose
identity checks on people travelling from Denmark
(Crouch: 2016)

"Invisible refugees: 'You are the only organisation that has ever visited us'
A quarter of the people living in Jordan are refugees, many of them Syrian;
living in poor areas, their conditions sometimes worse than in the camps"
(Van der Zen: 2016)

"Refugees Shouldn’t Be Bargaining Chips
In March, the European Union and Turkey struck a deal: Turkey would build
camps to house refugees who were refused entry to Europe, and the
European Union would pay for them — 3 billion euros (about $3.4 billion) in
the first instance, with another 3 billion euros to follow. Other countries were
watching closely, and we are now beginning to see the repercussions."
(Rawlence: 2016)

Three Days, 700 Deaths on Mediterranean as Migrant Crisis Flares
The latest drownings — which would push the death toll for the year to more
than 2,000 people — are a reminder of the cruel paradox of the
Mediterranean calendar: As summer approaches with blue skies, warm
weather and tranquil waters prized by tourists, human trafficking along the
North African coastline traditionally kicks into a higher gear.
(Yardley & Pianigiani: 2016)

Desperation Rising at Home, Africans Increasingly Turn to Risky Seas
These are a selection of headlines from newspapers from the United Kingdom and the United States, a miniature collage of what has been happening on the borders of the European Union throughout the years 2015 and 2016. Chronologically, the first headline describes the finding of a young Syrian refugee’s body, washed ashore on the Greek island of Lesbos (Smith: 2015; see further: the discussion of the aesthetics of refugees in 2.2), the second an attempt to organize and canalize the possibilities of for help (Weaver: 2015), the third the reaction of two states of the European Union to close borders and implement border controls (Crouch: 2016), the fourth a report from a Syrian refugees in Lebanon, living outside the zone of refugee camps and being far away from media attention in Europe (Van der Zen: 2016), the fifth a discussion and commentary regarding the deal between Turkey and the European Union about the return of non-accepted asylum seekers in the European Union, the sixth an article form May 2016 discussing yet another mass drowning of refugees in the Mediterranean (Yardley & Pianigiani: 2016) and finally, the seventh, a report from African refugees waiting along the north African shores to cross the Mediterranean Sea to reach Europe (Searcey: 2016).

These articles have been chosen randomly and instead of the presented headlines, one could have also found discussions on: the rise of right wing parties in Europe as an reaction to the influx of refugees, the changing nature of war and the civil war in Syria, failed (humanitarian) interventions and the crises in Libya, the absence of state actors in Afghanistan, Iraq, Somalia (amongst others), the rise of ISIS and Boko Haram, the so-called welcoming culture amongst European Citizens to refugees, increasing border patrols between the United States and Mexico and the role immigration plays in election campaigns in Europe and the United States, the allocation of transit visa to refugees, the role of the European border agency Frontex, the militarization of the European border controls, the suspension of the Schengen agreement between European
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States and the reintroduction of border controls and passport controls, artistic and civic reaction to such and the discrimination of refugees, the role of churches as spaces for hosting asylum seekers, the use of drones to surveillance borders, localizations of and reports from so called ‘migrant corridors’, ‘border zones’, ‘registration centers’, ‘shelters for asylum seekers’, the ‘Balkan route’ and Lesbos, Malta, Sicily or Lampedusa. And then again: The articles presented show a history of the times we are in, the times in which this thesis is written during the years 2015 and 2016.

A rising number of refugees and migrants have been trying to reach the European Union [EU] in these two years. Most of them tried to reach the European Union member states via the Mediterranean Sea or via a variety of routes through South East Europe (which have been subsumed under the moniker ‘the Balkan route’), but also e.g. through Russia. The United Nations High Commission for refugees [UNHCR] states that the three major countries of origin of people fleeing to Europe are Syria with 46.7%, Afghanistan (20.9%) and Iraq (9.4%) (UNHCR 2015a).

Between 2007 and 2011 Europe had already witnessed the arrival of large numbers of refugees, especially trying to cross the Mediterranean Sea and seeking to reach Malta, Italy (e.g. Sicily and Lampedusa) or Spain (BBC: 2009). The EU’s reaction has been an increase in border and sea patrols and granting the European border agency Frontex, based in Warsaw, massive financial and technological and political means and mandates (Human Rights Watch: 2009). 2015 marked a shifting point in the geographic point of inflow, in which Greece received more refugees than Italy for the first time since 2008. The UNHCR (2015b) stated in August 2015, that 250000 immigrants had reached Europe by sea, with 98000 arriving in Italy and 124000 reaching Greece (first and foremost via Turkey). By the end of the year 2015, the UNHCR estimated the total numbers of refugees reaching the European Union had been around one million for the year, three or four times the amount compared to previous years (the numbers are notoriously inexact), with a majority of refugees arriving in Greece (816752) and Italy (150317) by sea (UNHCR 2015c). In the first months of 2016 almost three
times as many refugees had been entering Greece compared to 2015, with a total amount of 123000 (Buchanan & Pecanha: 2016). In March, the so-called Balkan route had been closed and the aforementioned agreement between Turkey and the European Union had been put in practice, through which Turkey agreed to take back refugees who had been entering the EU illegally (mostly from Greece), with the EU accepting one person who had been recognized Syrian refugee from Turkey for every immigrant sent back. Additionally the EU agreed to support the Turkish government financially with €3 billion. The deal has been critiqued by Non-Governmental Organizations such as Amnesty International, Save the Children or Médecins Sans Frontières as well as by the UNHCR (Kingsley: 2016).

Through 2016 European nations states continued to close down their borders, using physical control mechanisms such as barb wired fences (e.g. Greece, Bulgaria, Hungary), the stationing of soldiers at borders (Macedonia), blocking transit (Slovenia), closing off border crossing points (Finland), implementing (temporary) tighter inspections (e.g. Denmark, Sweden, Germany, Austria) (Almukhtar, Keller & Watkins: 2015).

The situation in Europe, though intense, is not isolated, and globally the UNHCR announced in 2014 that the number of people forced to migrate had reached 59.5 million, the highest number since World War II and a 40% increase compared to 2011. Roughly equalling the populations of Italy or the United Kingdom. The UNCHR differentiates these 59.5 million as 19.5 million refugees, 38.2 million internally displaced people [IDP’s] and 1.8 million asylum seekers. The by far largest share of refugees is hosted by developing countries with 86%, the least developed countries according to the UN-development index alone host 25% of all refugees. In 2014 an average of 42.500 people were forced to flee on a daily basis (compared to 10.900 in 2010), the major countries hosting refugees are Turkey, Pakistan, Lebanon, Iran, Ethiopia and Jordan. Syrian refugees make up the largest group with almost 4 million, followed by Afghans (2.6 million). Out of the ten largest countries of refugee origin, six are African: Somalia, Sudan, South Sudan, the Democratic Republic of Congo, the Central African Republic and
Eritrea. In Syria alone, there are 7.6 million IDP’s, 3.6 Million in Iraq, 805000 in Afghanistan, 1.5 Million in South Sudan and 100000 in Mali. 10 million people worldwide are affected by statelessness (UNCHR: 2015d).

In late June 2016, the UNHCR published their “Global Trends” a review on forced migration in 2015. The figures are even harsher than in the previous year: a total amount of 65.3 million people were forcibly displaced in 2015, marking a record high number (if this would be a nation, it would be the 21st largest in the world). Out of these 65.3 million, 21.3 million persons were refugees, 40.8 million internally displaced people and 3.2 million asylum seekers. An estimated 12.4 million people were newly displaced in 2015 due to human rights violations, conflicts, persecutions, and generalized violence, which makes for an average of 24 people were displaced from their homes every minute of every day, 34000 people on a daily basis. More than half of all refugees originate from respectively Syrian Arab Republic, Afghanistan and Somali. The main hosting countries remained Turkey (2.5 million) Pakistan (1.6 million), Lebanon (1.1 million), Islamic Republic of Iran (979,400), Ethiopia (736100) and Jordan (664100). For the fifth consecutive year, the total number of refugees has increased: from 10.4 million at the end of 2011 to a 55 per cent rise in just four years. With 4.4 million individuals, the sub-Saharan Africa region hosted the largest number of refugees. Refugees originating from five countries (Somalia, South Sudan, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Sudan, and the Central African Republic) accounted for 3.5 million (80%) of the total refugee population residing in this region by the end of 2015. Out of the ten major source countries for refugees, five are African: Eritrea, Sudan, South Sudan, Central African Republic, Democratic Republic of the Congo.

The UNHCR’s seeks to find durable, comprehensive solutions to this heightened condition of global mobility through three related policies: Firstly, Voluntary Repatriation, which the UNHCR claims is, for many refugees, the preferred solution: to return to their country of origin, cities and homes in safety and in dignity, “with full restoration of national protection, based on a free and informed decision” (UNHCR, 2016). Secondly, Resettlement: Due to
long lasting conflicts and unstable political situations, wars and persecution (the crises in Somalia, Sudan and the Democratic Republic of the Congo for example go in their tenth consecutive year) or because of hosting countries’ inability to meet specific refugee needs, the UNHCR seeks to support refugee resettlement in a third country, transferring them to countries willing and able to admit them as refugees and to grant them permanent residence. Finally, Local Integration, which is the permanent inclusion of refugees in the asylum country, a process that should lead to permanent residence rights, potentially the acquisition of citizenship in the host country (UNHCR 2016).^2 In 2015 Voluntary Repatriation has proved the most popular of the three, albeit with low numbers compared to the scale of global displacement.

Globally, the orchestration and management of forced migration movements through policy responses on international, national and regional levels finds its most persistent organizational form in the refugee camp, those spaces thrown up to cater for displaced and often desperate people, but often becoming so settled and ordered as to constitute their de facto permanent residence. Camps present the dominant form of the organization and management of refugees, of their administration, sheltering and support (Barett, 1998). The term camp originates from the Latin word 'campus', describing an open field or a level space and was originally used to describe open spaces for military exercises, a space set within, but also set apart from other spaces (Hailey, 2009). Turner (2015) describes camps generally as the preferred means to contain displaced people, run either by States, Non-Governmental Organizations, Supra-National Organizations or the United Nations. Even though criticized conceptionally as well as practically, the camp remains the primary means of managing and containing refugees (Newhouse, 2015). They are meant to provide spaces of security, medical treatment and shelter for refugees and internally displaced people, existing “explicitly to provide the survival of those in greatest need” (Bulley, 2014: 63). It is the camp that I want to concentrate on, for it is here, in this most apparent organizational form which acts as a node in the mobile networks of

^2 A further discussion of local integration, resettlement and repatriation will follow during the text, also an analyses of UNHCR’s terminology, e.g. regarding repatriation as to be carried out on the basis of “free and informed choices” by refugees (UNHCR, 2016).
movement, that a sense of how refugees are organized and how refugees are organizing others, comes to the fore. Most existing camps are established in countries of the Global South reflecting the distribution of refugees worldwide. The UNHCR identifies six types: planned and managed camps, self-settled camps, collective centers, reception and transit camps, individual accommodation and finally various or unknown localizations. In 2015, 13.358200 million refugees were living in one of these places, making up 85% of the total refugee population. The category ‘individual accommodation’ plays a more and more crucial role in placing refugees, with a total amount of 9 million people currently accommodated, but the numbers are highly skewed by the current refugee flow from the Syrian conflict, nearly all of those are currently living in individual accommodation (UNHCR, 2016). Within this typology other forms seem to be emerging, for example Diken and Laustsen (2006: 450) note how “detention centers are spreading quickly” We will find further discussions and analyses of the camp throughout the text and will also engage in critically evaluating its use and means, its social and political implications.

This overview shows headlines and numbers, statistics and data: a birds-eye view on the field. With this, we are “as Icarus, flying above these waters, [where we] can ignore the devices of Daedalus in mobile and endless labyrinths far below” and “distangle [ourselves] from the murky intertwining daily behaviours and make [ourselves] alien to them” (deCerteau, 1988: 92-93). It sets a broad scene, into which I will fall, beginning with a foray into another story from Ancient Greece, that of Odysseus, the original wanderer.
2.2 Asylum seeker, entrepreneur, political hero and villain – on the complexity of refugee figures

Odysseus:
My name is Odysseus

Athene:
I only know you from the news. See, Odysseus, the destroyer of cities, the undefeatable fox in all deserts he created, returning on a life raft of junk. If I had only foreseen the possibility of such landing, I would have come with tape and camera and would have earned more from the selling of such illustrative news, then the destroyer of cities with all its prey.

Odysseus:
Cities are only destroyed, when they lie in the way of the good cause. It belongs to the inventible misses of even the most precise airstrikes, that the firepower occasionally misses the frontlines and airspaces of the enemy and comes down on marketplaces and schoolyards and hospitals...

Athene:
.... Collateral damage. Isn’t that called collateral damage? Over here, at the beaches, there holds an easy saying in such damaging event: Just miss is as good.

(Ransmayr, 2010: 17, own translation)

“...The core qualities of Odysseus, his resourcefulness, remorselessness and self-control will unfold, develop and cross-fertilize in the Odyssey. Faced with the unpredictability of the high seas, its monsters, its gods and its enchanters, Odysseus proves infinitely adaptable: he is decisive when impetuosity is required and gentle when moderation is called for. Faced with adversary, he proves himself a model of survival, using every device and wile to overcome it. At this level, Odysseus is a paragon of the bricolage. Unlike to many of todays managers, Odysseus never complains of inadequate resources.”

(Gabriel, 2003: 623)
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Odysseus, the centrepiece of two of the most important texts in literature, the Iliad and the Odyssey and one of the most widely discussed figures, is presented as a multitude, as villain and entrepreneur, as unorganized, as cunning, as heroic. The ambiguity of Odysseus becomes apparent through the exemplary excerpts presented above: Ransmayr describes him as a villain, the destroyer of cities, returning from years of plundering, raping and stealing only to find his home country Ithaca destroyed and laying fallow. The play “Odysseus, perpetrator (sic)” is situated in a “postwar-period as all-time; an ill-time [org: Unzeit; Italics in original] abeyant between present, future and an indelible past” (Ransmayr, 2010: 8). Gabriel on the other hand reminds us of the possibility to see Odysseus as an entrepreneurial figure, as a manager of resources and limitations and possibilities. Albert Camus (1991/1942: 75) describing Sisyphus as the “wisest and most prudent of mortals”, while also practicing the “profession of highwayman”, famously concluding: “I see no contradiction in this”. Odysseus, for some the son of Sisyphus, is also potentially the wisest man and a highwayman, a perpetrator of the bad yet a hero, a loving husband returning to his wife Penelope and his son Telemachus, as well as a pirate. And just as it is not only not a contradiction to be all of this, both Sisyphus and Odysseus can be both (and all the more) at the same time, changing between the states and modes depending on the situation and their use of it as well as what is inscribed into them.

Defining the refugee as ‘in between’

Gabriel reads Odysseus through an occasion happening on the shores of New York harbor on June 6th 1993: a shipwreck is found and a group of men and woman trying not to drown is reaching the shore, swimming. 282 illegal aliens, Chinese refugees, reach the United States and are being put into prison immediately by the authorities. And just like Odysseus, Gabriel (2003: 630) states, “the Chinese refugees hungry, cold and covered in brine, emerge from the hostile sea as The Other, the needy, the displaced, the incomprehensible” and though they appear as the unorganized other they cannot remain like this, they become part of an organizational
machinery, they are orchestrated and ordered, finger prints and photos are taken, they are put into detention centers and state prisons, their ability to move and manoeuvre is restricted, limited: 282 Chinese people become subject to the organizing force of state power.

Yet this organizing force is not able, or is unwilling, to integrate the other fully, indeed seems determined to keep the refugees in the category of the ‘other’. This being ‘in between’, in a limbo state, has been persistently used as form and means to define and inscribe refugees: They are in between, but being in such zone of indistinction means they are, like Odysseus, in an ambiguous and poly-variant position that invites analysis and repels determinate conclusion. From an etymological point of view, we come across the word ‘refugee’ for the first time in the late 17th century, when Calvinist Huguenots fleeing the Netherlands from prosecution reach France and are being conceptualized (sic) as réfugiés (those, who are taking shelter and seek protection), this framing finds further distribution when a hundred years later, the same group is forced to leave France (Zolberg et al, 1989: 5).

Ever since then the category ‘refugee’ has been used to describe a variety of different actors and subjects and masses of people. These definitions have been conceptualized and altered again by a wide variety of migration related actors, includes those, from which the refugee is fleeing and those who would like to hinder the flight, to those they are meeting, influencing, needing, making use of or being used by during the flight itself, to those governing, limiting or enabling any potential arrival. Politics links the ‘refugee’ to questions of inner or outer security and economic progress, political parties use the figure in simplifications as a basis for political success and party programs3, International Organizations and Non-Governmental Organizations frame and discuss the figure of the refugee, partly in strong opposition, partly in agreement to (supra-) national refugee policies, and finally, refugees themselves have an interest in shaping and

3 As we can see in the US presidential election campaign 2016, where Donald Trump is using the fear of the unspecific as a foundation for his campaign, as well as with the rise of right-wing parties in Europe throughout the 2015 – 2016 election period, e.g. in Denmark, Germany, France, Hungary and so forth as an immediate reaction to the so-called European refugee crises.
modulating the meanings of this social figure under which they themselves have been subsumed.

What seems to arise out of this argumentative and discursive struggle is not a complexification of the notion ‘refugee’, but rather a void, which serves as a frame, understood by all parties involved in the shaping of the figure, but filled and changed depending on political, social, cultural and economic demands at the time of the discussion (Inhetveen, 2010: 152). Maybe, a more restrictive, seemingly precise description of the ontologies of the term ‘refugee’ would be too limiting in light of the empirical manifoldness or the experience, reasons and perception of fleeing. On the other hand, as a delineation it is still quite prescriptive, and risks, as Haddad (2008) has rightfully warned, a political delimitation and hence exclusion of people subsumed into a singular category often for political reasoning.

Being in between has meant being, like Odysseus, a protean figure that resists any firm categorization. For decades now refugees have ranked high in public attention and experience an increasing interest in academic research. The social figure of the refugee has been researched in a variety of academic disciplines, leading to the emergence of a distinct field (Harzig & Hoerder, 2009). It is surprising, however, that there is no universally valid definition for the term ‘refugee’, and maybe even more so, since its appearance as a group and its use as such can be traced back for such a long time and its appearance has been causing numerous political, aesthetic, and social debates. This lack of a definition can partly be explained by the complexity and the highly political context of the subject (Haddad, 2008). In addition to the lack of a clear definition, the distinction between commonly used terms such as immigrant, refugee and asylum seeker is blurred and subject to an ongoing controversy among researchers and policymakers: “While some studies emphasize this distinction as crucial [...] others have declared it irrelevant. [...] still others have attempted to determine its importance on an empirical basis” (Gold, 1988: 411).

Historically, one of the first figures we come across regarding the refugee (and maybe ironically so, in times where the discussion on the
refugee is shaped mainly by the reappearance of its image either as victim or potential perpetrator) is the one of ‘the maker’, the refugee as an entrepreneurial figure (Inhetveen, 2010). Grounded in post-world war II experiences, the refugee appears as the one, who did make it, who suffered, but held on and who is willing to build and shape their own life, and also more structurally to join in the recreation of streets, cities, states, nations. Post-world war II German sociology for example, is impregnated by such a view on the refugees. Gerhardt (2000) describes such a sketching of the refugee, despite the suffering endured by this figure, as inherently entrepreneurial.

This figure of the refugee is followed by the story of the immigrant child, of figures like Steve Jobs, the story of second generation immigrants who founded businesses, went into politics, became part of the civil society. This figure is relatively independent of the political circumstances of her/his fleeing, it is perceived mainly through the experience of the economic and social possibilities of integration.

This separation of the political circumstances of fleeing from those who are forced to migrate and the inherent capacity of the refugee to build, to create and to make new and better lives, businesses and enterprises ends with the Cold War: the refugee appears from now on as political avant la lettre: the figure becomes the means and end of a political discourse: People fleeing both ways (from the west to the east and from the east to the west) become embroiled in ideological gaming, a condition best exemplified through the western perception of the figure, who is crossing the fences, walls, and barbed wires, symbolizing both the attractiveness of the system he or she is reaching as well as the de-dignifying circumstances of the political system he or she is fleeing from. The theorization of the refugee articulates the symbolic victory of a system, underlined and emphasized through the hardship of the fleeing itself. It is within these circumstances and realities, that Salamon (1991) has described the lack of willingness of Western states to accept people fleeing form the South as refugees; the use of the term and figure is bound to the nature of social and political opponents, prompting
questions as to whether accepting refugees is perceived as bolstering the systems into which they have fled vis-à-vis those they have left.

It is the end of the Cold War that marks historically the appearance of a new type of refugee, the one described earlier as the subject of humanitarianism. As Chimni (2000) has pointed out, the refugee now becomes the means and end of a variety of International and Non-Governmental Organizations who carry and care: carrying indeed becomes the new form of dealing and approaching refugees and it is in this sense that the figure is inscribed into discourses of victimization. We come across the refugee as the helpless child, the helpless mother, the helpless elderly. This inscription is still present and accentuated through a number of policies and measures advocated by both religious, civic and international organizations as well as by states. Malkki (1995: 10ff.) in a semiotic study has clarified the aesthetic appearance of such a perception as an almost Madonna like figure, which is being used as a symbol for the organizations governing and directing new forms of humanitarianism. While, for example, the actual number of men amongst refugees equals the number of woman and children, Non-Governmental Organizations and International Organizations often claim that the number of so called vulnerable people (e.g. children, women, elderly) make up to 80% of the total number of refugees worldwide.

The underlining gendering of refugees through such presentation remains seldom discussed, even though an implicit inscription of the potentially potent men (able to defend, attack, move, behave on his behalf) is mirrored and enforced through its oppositional representation of the vulnerability of the helpless woman and/or child.

Sørensen (2014) has historically analysed the production and organization of refugees, exemplified through an interpretation of the iconic photo of a young Jewish boy holding up his arms during the clearance of the Warsaw Ghetto by the Nazis, along with an interpretation of Paul Klee’s painting ‘Angelus Novus’, arguing the link between aesthetic presentation and the organising it implies is identified through the reading of the refugee as victim. The refugee understood as such remains, unlike the
entrepreneurial figure or the political hero, a figure of distance (Inhetveen: 2010). Implicit to such inscription is the de-politicizing effect of its nature, the refugee cannot cause danger or harm, but stays rhetorically, aesthetically and politically indeed far away from the audience, that is moved, touched and urged towards donations of help. Through this, the refugee as victim fulfils at least two purposes: it helps to intrinsically motivate members of those organizations, who seek to help the figure they have been socially producing, as well as satisfying the needs of politically distancing the figure from the audience that then, unthreatened, can be safely appealed to. The active and strategic distribution of the ‘refugee as victim’ stereotype reappears and is set out in charity appeals, journalism, politicians’ speeches, as a drama and staging of suffering (Inhetveen 2006). In its purest form, the refugee as a pure gesture and icon of a new humanitarianism comes across as the woman with a child, harmed and helpless, and those who lack the inscribed attributes either try to make up for it (through narration or comparison) or set themselves in relation to this stereotype (Turner: 2002). This discourse is not directed and orchestrated by the refugees themselves: it is imposed on them by a world of humanitarian help. This does not mean, however, that the discourse is not picked up and made use of by refugees; the stigmatization, the sketching as victim becomes possibly a means of identification, integration, exclusion or separation – depending on the audience to which this sketch is aimed, and hence offering opportunity for counter-narrating the sketch.

Countering the ‘victim’ discourse comes the refugee as ‘villain’ an epistemological opponent to the figure in need of assistance. The refugee as cunning crook as Horst (2006) coins it. Refugees enjoy, based on precisely their status as refugees, certain rights, and the cunning crook is expected to exploit those: he or she is manipulative and steals, lies about family members and the country of origin, the reasons for fleeing. He or she misuses the infrastructure provided, looking only to serve personal reasons or acting on behalf of the vested interests of a political or military group. The Kenyan government, for example, has called the world’s largest refugee camp Dadaab a “nursery for al Shabaab”, a militant Islamic group operating
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in the Horn of Africa (The Guardian, 2015). Of course alternative accusations surround the same camp, with some suggesting Al Shabaab then, somewhat ironically, serves as an argumentative and actual reason for the upholding of the very same camp, since its mainly Somali inhabitants have been fleeing the war between the remains of the Somali Government (supported by, amongst others, the Kenyan army) and the very same militia Al Shabaab, which uses the camp and Kenyan ground as recruitment station, hospital and resting place for its fighters. The villains are everywhere, and nowhere.

The same in Europe and the USA where the arrival of refugees or immigrants is greeted with often-implicit accusations concerning their villainy: they lie about their country of origin, or throw their passports away in order to benefit from social systems. Indeed, studies (e.g. Kibreab, 2004) do show misuse of systems, and commonly identify refugees seeking benefits and advantages through undermining social systems and administration. But while in other sociological fields, such behaviour can be perceived as adaption, its appearance amongst refugees labels the very same figure a crook and lawbreaker. This mistrust in the refugee per se, whether he or she actually is rightfully fleeing or forced to migrate, i.e. in accordance with the current states of laws, one is common, especially is further fuelled through an alarmist fear of the entrance of radical religious and extremist political views into these countries under the refugee label.

The ‘crook’ and the ‘victim’ are two figures, which do not only exist in opposition to each other, but are often embedded in social discourses around refugees at the same time. Both figures are used to mark refugees in respective groups, to then base political actions and arguments as a response to the co-emergence and existence of the two. The figure of the villain and the crook merge and become important at the same time for political discourses and actions.

Defining the refugee through mobility

Woven into these attempts to equate the refugee with an in-between status, or liminal one, of victim and criminal, comes another equated with
those who are on the move, usually forcibly. At its core, the term ‘refugee’ revolves around some form of human migration – which describes a temporal or permanent change of residence by individuals or groups of people. Reviewing literature about migration brings up several factors that are often used to categorize different kinds of migration. One important differentiator is the migrant’s freedom of choice about their departure. Migrants can be assigned to one of two groups according to this factor. The first group consists of free migrants “who decide when to depart and where to go according to their own desires and life-projects” (Harzig & Hoerder, 2009: 67). The second group contains forced migrants – including all kinds of involuntary migrants such as forced labour migrants (including those that have been enslaved or kidnapped); migrants displaced by political, religious or other intolerance; refugees from war or other violence and persons displaced by ecological disasters (Harzig & Hoerder, 2009). While this distinction enables a first typology of migrants, there are still cases that might not clearly fit in one of the two categories, for example “bound labour migrants who have to sell their labour for a number of years because of poverty” (Harzig & Hoerder, 2009: 67). Still, it becomes obvious that refugees – who often lack any choice about their departure, who usually do not make extensive plans before their departure (Gold, 1988) and who are often ill suited to take up employment elsewhere because of country specific skills and qualifications (Wauters & Lambrecht, 2007: 202) – belong to the second group of forced migrants. This, it seems, differentiates them from those migrants who voluntarily and consciously decide to migrate and who often “carry substantial financial assets” with them (Bager, 2003: 221).4

Another key attribute characterizing refugee mobility is the reason for their departure. According to the United Nations Convention and Protocol relating to the Status of Refugees, a refugee is defined as a person who “owing to well-founded fear of being persecuted for reasons of race, religion, nationality, membership of a particular social group or political opinion, is outside the country of his [sic] nationality and is unable or, owing to such

---

4 It should not be forgotten, however, that refugees embody a significant flow of resources to their host countries, bringing “human capital in the form of labor, skills and entrepreneurship” (Jacobsen, 2002: 577-578).
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fear, is unwilling to avail himself of the protection of that country; or who, not having a nationality and being outside the country of his former habitual residence as a result of such events, is unable or, owing to such fear, is unwilling to return to it” (UNHCR, 1951).

Following this definition, refugees are not only characterized by the lack of choice about their departure, but also by a forced migration based on some form of persecution. From a psychological perspective, refugees may have experienced traumatic events that “can cause psychological problems, which hamper self-reliance and self-employment” (Wauters & Lambrecht, 2007: 201). These are “generally considered to be more severe than those of [other] immigrants” (Gold, 1988: 413).

Given this sense of migration being a response to threat, it should be noted that the UNHCR definition has been subject to criticism as it includes only migrants who depart reactively but excludes “people who proactively analyze deteriorating circumstances and leave on their own” (Harzig & Hoerder, 2009: 137-138). Reading and understanding refugees as victims obviously affects the public opinion and the acceptance of refugees. Recalling the earlier categorization of the ‘in between’, one explanation for the emergence of this narrative is that the humanitarian effort to distinguish refugees from migrants has had to be so vigorous that it is now very hard to imagine a refugee as anything other than a victim (Braithwaite, 2016).

Despite the criticism of above definition, it seems to be commonly accepted in academic research to define refugees as a group of forced migrants that “flee their country because they are being persecuted and, as a consequence, [...] leave for humanitarian reasons” (Wauters & Lambrecht, 2007: 201). This creates a contrast to other groups of migrants, such as economic immigrants, who usually leave their country in search of more economic security.

The forced nature of their departure has far-reaching consequences for refugees. The social network of refugees in their new host country is for example “likely to be less extensive than that of [other] immigrants”
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(Wauters & Lambrecht, 2007: 201). The creation and maintenance of mutual assistance networks can be more difficult for refugees than for other immigrants, although this effect is probably diminished by the rise of today's digital communication channels. Refugees are also "likely to have fewer social contacts with their home country through return visits" (Cortes, 2004: 465). In contrast to other immigrants, refugees are usually determined to stay in their host country for a longer or even infinite amount of time. Often, it is "no longer possible for them to return to their country in order to acquire funds, capital or a labor force for their business" (Wauters & Lambrecht, 2007: 201). The threat of persecution often deprives refugees of the opportunity to return to their home country, meaning they continue to be refugees as it seems only on return is their status at an end (Cortes, 2004).

Towards an integrated view

Looking over the studies and reports of refugees gives rise to a way of understanding refugees, which combines both their status as 'in between' or 'other' and as groups perpetually on the move and in flight, spurred by threat. It is a spatial understanding centred on the camp. This is where the organization of refugees tends to cumulate, being both a liminal space that houses those in need and despair or manages the otherwise unruly and criminal. The organization called the camp seems to offer an perspective for grounding for approaching an analysis on how the social figure of the refugee is produced. It is to such an analysis, that I will now turn.

2.3. The organization of the mobile, unknown other

"I sit on the kerb
The driver changes the wheel.
I don’t like to be, where I’m coming from.
I don’t like to be, where I’m going to."
Bertolt Brecht’s nameless first person narrator from his poem “Changing the wheel” from 1953 finds himself in a limbo state, an in-between; and this in-between imposes stress and impatience on him. This limbo state seems interesting in two ways in the context of the studies of refugees. Firstly, the nameless narrator is thrown into the situation, it comes upon him, without him causing it, the reason for him sitting on the kerb is a broken wheel. Secondly, he knows about the past (“I don’t like to be, where I’m coming from”), and he is sure about the future (“I don’t like to be where I am going”) meaning there is an assertion about the situation, which claims knowledge and a negative reflection about both circumstances. Nevertheless, the current situation is not perceived as a break, an outbreak out of the known, but imposes an even more stressful situation on the narrator. Maybe, we can say, that it is the force, the impossibility of choice, which resonates with a similarly felt feeling in refugees? It appears that there is nothing to be done, no way of organizing oneself otherwise, only a subjection to being organized by circumstances beyond one’s control. It seems they are to be placed and left on a kerb, with the barest of organizational support.

The camp is akin to an organizational form set up on the kerbside, and which organizes those within in ways that keep them there. Much has been written on these organizations. For example as a “[global] space for humanitarian management of the most unthinkable and undesirable populations of the planet” (Agier, 2002: 320) or as “globalized problems” (Malkki, 202: 351) requiring universal standards and comparable measurement, or as forces of institutionalization of dogmatic regimes.
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(Crisp, 2006). All these turns and perspectives twist, point to, sharpen, (de)mystify, clarify, broaden and embedded themselves into questions of organizing. Still, while the study of refugees has established itself as a field of its own, with its own journals, conferences, discussions and language (turning from the study of refugees to the study of forced migration), the questions raised and evolving around refugees seem largely underrepresented within the field of organization studies itself. Notable exceptions to this range from studies of management development when working together with refugees (e.g. Valentine, 1989), methodology and research processes (Hardy, Phillips & Clegg: 2001) and ethnographic encounters (Young, 2005), Integration and Human Resource Management (sic!) (Jones & Halcomb Lewis: 2003), self- development and community practices (Kroll & Vandenberg: 1996), discursive struggles within migration systems (Hardy & Phillip: 1999) migration and entrepreneurship (Ram, Theodorakopoulos & Jones: 2008), organizing against the background of traumatic experience and the rise of new organizational forms (Cruz: 2014), climate change (Welzer: 2008; Gosling & Case: 2013; Nyberg, Spicer & Wright: 2013) or rights of and material help for refugees within an analysis of a sociology of work. While these studies often focus on specific local contexts, or orientate themselves along certain practices, an attempt to understand the logics and politics of the organization of refugees (and refugee) camps, as well as organizational practices amongst refugees, is underrepresented in the field.

In relation to refugees one might hope to find a turn, a discussion of different spaces of organizing apart from the office and managerial practices in enterprises, bureaucratic organizations, or failing that an opening up of the field to artistic practices or the organization of spontaneous events, or political movements, or the articulation of movements in what may be termed the dark side of organizing. Perhaps the camp or camp like structures (concentration camps, prisons, military camps, gated communities, maybe even cruises, boarding schools, hospitals and definitely: the refugee camp) may be subsumed under this notion of the dark side given “there is nothing lighthearted about the [...] dark side – situations in which people
hurt other people, injustices are perpetuated and magnified, and the pursuits of wealth, power, or revenge lead people to behaviours that others can only see as unethical, illegal, despicable or reprehensible” (Griffin & Leary Kelly, 2004: 1). The camp seems to fit here, yet it hardly occurs. Instead research in the field of dark(er) sides addresses, for example, workplace aggression (Baron: 2004), stress and aggression (Neumann: 2004), sexual harassment (Paetyold: 2004) and sexual discrimination (Deitch et al: 2004), careerism (Brattion & Katmar: 2004) or drug and alcohol abuse in organizations (Harris, 2004). While these studies are of extreme value in broadening the field and the perspectives that can and need to be included in order to understand everyday practices within organizations, fewer studies have tried to open the scope of the field to other spaces of organizing.

Other authors have suggested, that indeed the perspective on organizational politics, or indeed a darker side of organization may be too narrow (Clegg, Courpasson & Phillips, 2006). They support the study of other, maybe more extreme, organizational forms such as camps, indeed with some suggesting that “today, as [...] institution[s], such as Abu Graibh and Guantanamo Bay, has once again become a part of the public policy apparatus to be deployed by governments against those others that they create, shouldn’t an ethically relevant and morally concerned organization scholarship have something to say and be able to draw on precedents to do so?” (Clegg, 2006: 429). The study of phenomena, events or spaces like prisons, detention centers, or refugee camps remains underrepresented in the study of organizations and institutions, despite their moral and scholarly importance. For example, Stinchcombe (2005) has suggested focusing on extremist religious groups, when studying religious practices for the possibilities of insights and the occupation of the lives of the members of such groups. And Marti & Fernandez (2013) stress that an engagement with extreme cases offers insights about institutional work, logics of power and domination, ordering and resistance to order, which do not only offer insights into the respective cases they discuss, but valuably open and broaden the
field of organization studies concerning research on less-extreme cases. Linstead et al have suggested that the study of the dark side of organizations will bring “new and neglected phenomena” into existing organization studies (2014: 165), but the study of organization and their dark side remains largely situated within known organizational phenomena and institutions. Work moving beyond these spaces for example includes the aforementioned studies on the orchestration and organization of historic images and their contextualization and inscription into common understandings of the past (Sørensen, 2014) and the reading of the oscillating forces of domination and suppression on the one hand and resistance on the other (Marti & Fernandez, 2014). These studies may be read in line with new attempts to position, or reposition organization theory, positioning then understood as a political and social decision to relate research to the world it seeks to describe and make sense of (Böhm, 2006: 4).

I will come back to speculate about possible reasons for the absence of camp research throughout the thesis. As for now, I want to introduce and explicate three notable exceptions to this oversight. I will not present the arguments of each of the works in length and detail, but only give an overview (and hence return to the beginning of the chapter in a way) of the main ideas and outline the reasons for their importance for the studies of organization in general and this thesis in particular. All three studies reference and understand their organizations using the work of Zygmunt Bauman and Erving Goffmann. Goffmann’s (1961) work on total institutions is of particular value to these studies: total institutions describe a set of power relations, which cannot be escaped, they surround, and limit, their power can only

---

6 Marti & Fernandenz themselves have taken on the study of one of the most extreme cases of organizational logics (and the resistance to it), the Holocaust. They draw, amongst other thinkers, heavily on the latter discussed book “The order of Terror” by Wolfgang Sofsky.

7 The author is aware of the fact that the presentation of three works, regardless of their influence and importance to the field beyond the limitations of this thesis is limiting in itself. Nevertheless, the three works by Sofsky, Agier, Diken and Laustsen, present not only a great overview of what lies within the field, but are also important contributions to the study at hand. Further discussion would for example also include “From Camp to City. Refugee camps in Western Sahara,” edited by Manuel Herz, this volume traces the processes of urban transformations within and through refugee camps from a sociological-architectural point of view.
hardly be resisted, an institutional force which will let the individual with no possibility for escape, producing and exercising absolute power over the individual. Bauman (1989) then uses the concept of the total institution and tries to understand the organizational processes and force of the Holocaust, situating the event, despite its historical uniqueness, into the logics of modern bureaucratic routines and managerial rationalities.

In this context, the first of the three works is a book presenting a spatial account and focus on the organization of camps, more specifically, on the organization of national socialistic concentration camps. The philosopher, sociologist and political scientist Wolgang Sofsky’s “The order of terror” (Die Ordnung des Terrors) analyses the history, spaces and time, social structures, work and violence and death within and of national-socialist concentration camps. The goal of this undertaking, Sofsky (2008) writes, is “a thick description of the unfolding of power in the world of the concentration camp” (24). The concentration camp in this sense appears as a world within another one, one which co-exists with another one or multiple other ones at the time, but is strictly separated from them, qualifying the system of concentration camps as worlds on their own. We come across such a notion through a description of another system of prison camps, the famous “Gulag Archipelago”, which inscribes the net of prison- and work-camps over the Soviet Union as a chain of island, separated from one another and separated from the world it is within (Solschenizyn, 2008). Parts of Sofky’s book are dedicated to a description of the processes of organizing this other world, the concentration camp (the arrival of camp inmates, the ordering and marking through numbers, clothing, signs, symbols, the regulation and rules, the absolute power of members of the SS over the inmates, the processes of selection, the slow dying in the camps in the form of the Muselmann, and finally the fabrics of death: the extermination camps): the concept of absolute power (reaching its aim only if no exception from it is possible any more) serves as the real threat throughout the sociological analysis.

The arrival of the first inmates at the first national socialist concentration camp Dachau near Munich on the 22nd of March 1933 is
described as an ongoing organizational process in itself; neither camp nor guards are ready or prepared, the first (mostly political) prisoners (needless to say: the least of all to be prepared for what was to come) have to build their shelters themselves, the guards try to establish an order where order (and orders) are still missing. But soon, one defining characteristic of the concentration camp is the definition of social zones, the ordering of time and space, spaces are separated through fences, electricity, walls, barb wire, gates, mine fields, creating restricted spaces within. Routines are managed through absolute control over time and its structuring, while these structures can be broken or interrupted without reason, and hence destroy the connectivity between past, present and future upon which humans are so reliant (61 ff.). Sofsky further analyzes major categories of social structuring within the camp (guards and personal, the aristocracies of prisoners on the one hand and the mass society of prisoners on the other) and its respective subcategories with respective social roles and classes (115ff.). Work in and around concentration camps is analyzed regarding the relation of work situations and circumstances in the concentration camp to slave labour, the relationship between state owned and/or private companies to the concentrations camps and the workforce it could provide (IG Farben´s link to Auschwitz may be the most prominent example here) and the limbus between work and the forces of destruction and death being realized through such work. Finally, Sofsky analyzes the concentration camp as a space of indirect destruction of humans (most notably then resulting in Muselmänner⁸, as the Lager-jargon named those on the edge of dying while still alive) and the systematic, industrial death machineries these spaces partly turned into in the form of extermination camps, understanding these processes as the transformation of absolute power into its own totalization (276ff.)

Sofsky’s analyses nevertheless does not limit itself in the description of the organization (even though, maybe alongside with the rather early post

---

⁸ The Muselmann then is the "destroyed human between life and death" (Sofsky: 2008: 229). We will come across the notion Muselmann and its meaning later in the thesis and in more depth again.
world war II published book “Der SS-Staat” by Eugen Kogon⁹, it still in itself presents an extremely rich and valuable work): the strength of the study (and also the worryingly uncanny feel about it) comes with its attempt at demystifying the space of the camp to the point where it is removed from any supposed historic singularity. Sofsky inserts the concentration camp right into “the history of modern society” (2008: 315). He leaves no doubt that “mass murder needs organization [...] repetitive killing is not an act, but an exercise with all notions of work: planning, duration, goal orientation, routine” (2008: 39). Without neglecting the extremes of the case of the concentration and extermination camp in the National Socialist -time, the author remains open to other forms of total institution which share elements of the concentration camp, such as military camps and casernes, mental institutions and psychiatrics, prisons and convict colonies in and through which the exercise of absolute power over individuals has been developed and tested. And whilst the ordering of terror in Buchenwald and Mauthausen, Treblinka and Maidanek is without comparison for its totalizing intensity, for the terror here “realizes its freedom in the complete destruction of the human” (2008: 321), the organizational capabilities and mechanism, the shift of sovereign power from the sovereign to the individual (who exercises sovereign power in form of absolute power) hints at and finds realization in other organizational forms.

Another notable work, which opens the notion of organizing for the topic of refugees and, more specifically, refugee camps is the book “Managing the undesirable: Refugee camps and humanitarian government” by the French anthropologist and ethnographer Michel Agier (2011),¹⁰ Based on 7 years of field work in refugee camps in Zambia, Kenya, Sierra Leone and Guinea and the West Bank, Agier reflects on refugee camps as space, which are not the place to shelter, help, and support the vulnerable, but

⁹ Eugen Kogon has been imprisoned in numerous concentration camps himself, for the longest time at Buchenwald concentration camp close to Weimar in Germany, which serves as an outstanding example and basis for his analyses and on which he draws particular attention.

¹⁰ Algier has also been working for the Non-Governmental Organization: Médecins Sans Frontières in refugee camps worldwide, with a focus on refugee camps in Africa.
places, in which large populations, undesired by society, are being managed through enclosure (2011: 4). Agier begins by setting the scene, describing the current state and politics of the international refugee politics and humanitarian regime and focusing in particular on refugee camps (and in this regard mostly on camps in Sub-Saharan Africa through fieldwork observing the everyday life), the "most standardized, planned and official form" (2011: 52). He then draws at length on personal encounters and ethno-graphic work (and also his work for the French based NGO Médecins Sans Frontières) with and on refugees in camps in Kenya, Zambia, Sierra Leone, Liberia and Guinea. Agier identifies camps as "spaces of socialization and extra-territoriality [...], as spaces of representation of the individual and the world" and as spaces of the exercise and organization of power (2011: 177). The first reading points to the changing nature of refugee camps, potentially arising out of informal, rather un-organized refugee settlements and self-organized camps, into planned, managed and orderly spaces under the supervision and structures of UNHCR, NGO’s and/or host country representatives, transforming into city-like settlements, often undistinguishable from the cities and villages they were once separated from. The second reading concerns the values and moral dispositions produced in such spaces, which often establish themselves and remain as an understanding of the refugee as victim, which needs to be taken care of. The third understanding of refugee camps reflects the government camp, the processes and hierarchies which are implemented in order to maintain and organize and mirroring the global networks amongst actors involved (NGO’s, UNHCR, state actors) necessary for upholding the production of the humanitarian machinery and the author "demonstrates the discursive power that humanitarian organizations have over defining and categorizing the displaced individuals in camps (Nawyn, 2012: 57). These camps then are manifested as spaces in which "waiting and absence may constitute the very essence of the present" (Agier, 2011: 77). The strength of Agier’s analyses lies in the combination of the observations - being on the ground and "in the dust" (2011: 6), through ethno-graphic vignettes illustrating "some of the themes tackled within this broad study of humanitarian action in refugee camps and, ultimately, constitute an earnest invitation [...] for more long
term and in depth monographs of refugee camps” (Bachelet, 2012: 151) - with an analysis of the governmental practices enacted in these spaces. And while being part of the humanitarian machinery responsible for the ordering and maintenance, the organization of shelter and medical care, remaining critically distant to their practices and politics.

Finally, the work of Bülent Diken and Carsten Bagge Lausten (2006) on “Sociology facing the camp: from refugee camps to gated communities” presents an engagement with the space of the camp in its multiplicities. Whereas the previously mentioned works have contributed to the discussion of the space of the camp from an historical perspective, coming to live through thick descriptions (‘the order of terror’) and an ethnographic and anthropological encounter with refugee camps (‘Managing the undesirables’) the notion and logic of camp in Diken’s & Laustsen’s analysis is promoted as having moved “from the peripheries of modern society and the status of laboratory in which extreme limits of de-humanized life, peeled down to its purest zoological, pre-social or post-social kernel, were bared, experimented with and tested, to the centre of social life” (Bauman, 2005: vii). The authors argue that in modern society exception and the normal enter a stage of indiscernibility, with the camp, which becomes a space of indistinction. Recalling the origin of the Latin word campus as a space for military exercise, the authors emphasize the fact that the camp used to be an exceptional space, outside the normal traits and processes of society, but convincingly argue that the logics of the camp have entered the very society from which it used to be separated (2005: 5). The strength of their argumentation resides then precisely in their ability to convincing read the camp not entirely as a space, but as a production machine of logics with profound political implications, which not only make the separation between the inside and outside more vague and difficult, but also show the transference of such camp logics into fields, areas and spaces in unforeseen ways. The argumentation follows Foucault’s, in that the observations and discussions of the abnormal in a society are irreversibly being linked to their normal sides: witnessing the abnormal allows us to see the normal as it actually appears (Foucault, 1980: 329). Hence Diken and Laustsen engage
with the camp as a space lying within our ‘normal’ societies, but remaining outside of it, shaping and defining what it is situated within. This situating of the logics of the camp within allows them to read its structures into the everyday of ‘our’ lives in, what one might perceive, radical ways. Under the generalizing aegis of this spatial analysis of the camp they move from rape wars (rape as a means and weapon in war) to the party zones of Ibiza, from contemporary tourism club med culture to equally contemporary terrorist movements. What they read as common between the spaces and organizations is that they all entail logics of the camp, the outside transformed into the inside and occupying and shaping the world it used to be separated from:

“[T]he camp is the materialization of the avoidance of the unprepared encounter, an attempt to avoid (the confrontation with) the other. Its instruments, neutrality and segregation, make it impossible, by defining others before they are met, to confront others and to take choices. The logic of the camp is, from the point of ethics, to kill the beneficial anarchy of communication between the one and the other” (Diken & Laustsen, 2006: 192).

Returning to Brecht and his narrator, who remains a stranger, or the other, who is sitting at the kerb, thrown into a situation, in which the unknown is organized around him? This narrator is neither in Ibiza, nor in a refugee camp in Sierra Leone, nor can we describe him as the Muselmann in concentration camps, yet he is there in the in-between, feeling impatience in the wake of a seemingly endless, or at least, unforeseeable waiting. This feeling is the defining atmosphere covering the poem, the narrator, the reader, and by extension the figure of the refugee. In any moment before (or as the inhabitant of any camp like structure: a concentration camp, a deportation side, a detention center, a self –organized space), the refugee is a citizen, a mother, father, a child, a criminal, a hero, a villain, an entrepreneur, an unemployed, and in any moment after he or she is bound to fewer inscriptions, which limit and or open up space and possibility to manoeuvre, but which are always imposed and hence prevent the possibility
of acting upon oneself. “It is waiting above all, which gives meaning to the suspension of time in the everyday life” as Agier notes (2011: 77). This is true in the case of the camp as well as during the wheel change.

Brecht’s nameless character is in a situation of organizing: the wheel is being changed, he remains in dependence to materiality (the street he is sitting on, the wheel itself, the car which is not functioning without the wheel) and persons (the driver) and he has to organize this, his momentum himself, has to deal with the effects of being in a state in-between. He has to organize his presence (and handle the effects of such organization) against the background of a past and a future.

This scene then also hints at the aim of this thesis to situate the discussion of the organization of refugee camps, within a post-foundational understanding of politics. At the same time as Francis Fukuyama published his historical-philosophical reading of the end of the 20th century in which the west (as a political entity) seemingly won over its social, economic and political competitor, the East, and the world was bearing witness to the alleged triumph of human rights, market system and democracy, Judith Butler wrote a contrary text on contingent foundations (1992). Here Butler reflects on the notion of postmodernism (a notion which may be replaced herein with the aforementioned postfoundational), stating that: “if there is a point [to postmodernism, or post-structuralism as Butler prefers], it is that power pervades the very conceptual apparatus that seeks to negotiate its terms, including the subject position of the critic; and further, that this implication of the terms of criticism in the field of power is not the advent of a nihilistic relativism incapable of furnishing norms, but rather, the very precondition of politically engaged critique.” (1992: 7). This is an important point: Postfoundational Political thought (we are going to stay with this notion from now on) does not dissolve a discussion of the political in an arbitrary "anything goes", but opens for the possibility and negotiation of multiple foundations for politics and political norms. Butler’s suggestion hence could best be “described as an ontological weakening of the status of
foundations without doing away with foundations entirely” (Marchart, 2007: 14).

Paul Ricoeur’s text “The Political Paradox” published in 1955 in his work ‘History and Truth’, distinguishes two streams of thinking about (and enacting) politics. One stream, informed by Rousseau and Aristotle, describes ‘the political’ as the engagement of free man in matters of politics, an organization of the political sphere based on an equal society. The other thinking of politics is informed and exemplified through Machiavelli’s and Marx’s understanding of politics (also named as such in difference to the former11), as the struggle of man [sic], the intention to inform and enforce one’s will over another group in society. The first notion of politics (the political) can only become through the latter (politics), hence creating the political paradox that “the greatest evil adheres to the greatest rationality” (Ricoeur, 1965/1955: 249), indeed they “mutually presuppose each other” (Schaap, 2013: 6).

How can such discussion of the political difference between politics and the political, as Oliver Marchart puts it in his seminal work on postfoundational political thought, be of help when reflecting on the politics of organizing and producing refugee camps? “Society will always be in search for an ultimate ground, while the maximum that can be achieved will be a fleeting and contingent grounding by way of politics – a plurality of partial grounds. This is how the differential character of the political difference is to be understood: the political (located, as it were, on the ‘ontological’ side of Being-as-ground) will never be able fully to live up to its function as Ground – and yet it has to be actualized in the form of an always concrete politics that necessarily fails to deliver what it has promised” as Marchart argues (2007: 8). Revolution does not need to be resolved in a final argument, but can serve as a basis for negotiating and problematizing the paradox it entails and bears as with regard to producing refugee camps.

11 In German, the distinction between politics and the political is die Politik und Das Politische, in French it is: le politique and la politique (Schaaf, 2013: 1; Marchart, 2007: 1).
In order to examine the struggle and difference of politics and to make this paradox productive for a discussion of the socially produced and producing logics of the camp, we have to examine the philosophical background of this difference. The distinction between le politique and la politique originates in a reading of Heidegger, which translates his ontological difference, the difference between ‘Sein’ und ‘Seiend’, between the ontic and the ontological. These terms are interdependent as Marchart (2007:21) notes, for “we cannot but think about Being other than in the sense of the political; being-qua-being turns into being-qua-the political. On the other hand, between this ontological realm of ‘being’ and the sedimented realm of social beings we encounter an unbridgeable chasm, an abyss, which, by dividing the ontopolitical from the ontic side of politics, at the very same time unites them in a never-ending play (and it is this play which in itself is of a deeply political nature).”

We are introduced here to the terminology of the never-ending play, which is uniting the difference; this is essential for two reasons: On the one hand, it highlights the relational aspect between politics and the political, on the other hand it hints at an understanding of this interdependence as an openness or undecidability, opposing an understanding of the political difference to be resolved in a fixture or closure – the play cannot be resolved into a final foundation. Furthermore, this short introduction may serve as a starting point for a further understanding of what therefore must be called a post-foundational condition of discussing politics. If there is play and openness, in opposition to closure and fixture - foundations - there must be the possibility for a multiplicity of foundations (and this is also the reason why a post-foundationalism cannot be a mere anti-foundationalism and hence not a dualistic way in which a foundationalism stands in contrast to an opposite; again more of an opening of a concept than a closure). Returning to the fundamental difference of Fukuyama’s notion of ‘the end of history’ and Butler’s world of contingent foundations, we may suggest that the deconstruction of the ground leads us into an abyss, and these are inherently interlinked: “Ground and a-abyss remain intimately intertwined. Therefore ground, as the dimension of grounding/regrounding, does not disappear –
as it may in crude forms of anti-foundationalism – but is put under erasure” (Marchart, 2007:20). This hints at an understanding, that even in the absence of a final ground, several grounds can be found, detected and established, even if only on the basis of a momentum or as event (and indeed only as a possibility of such, for a grounding, which would present itself as non-processual would be a closure, a fixed end-point).

Two thinkers, who can be credited for laying a foundation for the translation of the Heideggerian ontological difference into the sphere of politics, Carl Schmitt and Hannah Arendt\(^{12}\), share the thesis of neutralization of politics through the social: "The primacy of the political is not a triumphant but an endangered primacy – always in danger of becoming entirely closed up in the ‘iron cage’ of bureaucratized, technologized, and depoliticized society" as Marchart remarks (2007: 44). An understanding of the political being under threat of forces of society, economy or technology, is shared by many authors discussing the political difference in a leftist Heideggerian tradition and presupposes the idea of an autonomy of the political sphere and hence allowing for the political to be of institutional power, e.g. in establishing a social momentum or becoming an actor within the political sphere (Marchart, 2007: 49).

Such an understanding of politics and an understanding of the studies of camps, which conditions and affects are evoked by Brecht’s description of the wheel change, constitute a kind of grounding from which I will approach the study of the camp as a phenomenon of organization on and from the margins, which necessarily then is also in touch with and refers back to what is central and determining, and as a phenomenon of enduring and waiting, which is also in touch with what is transitory and fleeting.

---

\(^{12}\) Even though both Arendt and Schmitt share the theoretical-political discussion of the political difference and can be perceived as Heideggerian in this sense, there are remarkable differences in their analyses: Whereas Arendt distinguishes between real politics and an a-political politics; whereas the apolitical presents a perverted form of politics, the notion of real politics is based on the idea of an acting together of members in a free society. Schmitt, on the other hand, situates the discussion of the political difference in a friend/enemy scheme (Marchart, 2007: 35 – 44).
The Politics of Organizing Refugee Camps
3 The Naked and the Sovereign

“It seemed to K. as if all contact with him had been cut, and he was more of a free agent than ever. He could wait here, in a place usually forbidden to him, as long as he liked, and he also felt as if he had won that freedom with more effort than most people could manage to make, and no one could touch him or drive him away, why, they hardly had a right even to address him. But at the same time—and this feeling was at least as strong—he felt as if there were nothing more meaningless and more desperate than this freedom, this waiting, this invulnerability.”

(Kafka, 2009/1926: 95)

“The lived experience of space is not divorced from theory”

(Lefebvre, 1991/1974: 316)

The camp is a liminal space, and as a site of research something, which, as I have suggested, has largely been avoided in organization studies, notably in relation to refugees. Yet researching these spaces (and researching the spaces through a spatial perspective) can, precisely because camps are on the edge or threshold of things and so potentially more visible from within, yield interesting insights as to how and why organizations politically affect and effect our understanding of others and ourselves as insiders and/or outsiders, as those who are belonging and those who are being outcast, of being included and excluded. Perhaps one of the most influential and pre-eminent thinkers of such threshold spaces was not an academic, but a novelist – Franz Kafka. ‘The Castle’ [Das Schloss] is his last novel posthumously published four years after his death in 1922. It unfolds around seemingly clear images and symbols, spaces and characters. The protagonist, K., is an outsider, a land surveyor\(^\text{13}\), coming from far away,

\(^{13}\) Interestingly enough, Fingerhut (1996: 181) points at the possibility of reading land surveyor (in German: Landvermesser), literally as the measurer of land, he who measures, takes measure of the land he wonders, hence a figure conceptualized as vagrant, tramp or drifter, a figure which is conceptually close to the refugee as we have seen and a figure resembling those refugees Elfride Jelinek is describing at the opening of chapter 2)
seeking to speak with and work for the nobleman, Count Westwest\textsuperscript{14} (who remains absent throughout the novel) of the castle, where he thought to have found an occupation. K. arrives at a remote village at night, it is deep winter and this is where we will stay with K. for six days, the rest of the novel: all his attempts and endeavours to get in personal contact with his (potential) employer, even the space of the castle, fail; K. is learning (and so are we as the reader), that he cannot gain access to the castle. Upon arrival, K. rests in the village at the bottom of the mountain on which the castle rests.

Throughout the novel, K.’s attempts to justify his presence become the sole content of life. Through the snow-covered streets and through his emotions, his relationship and a brief love affair, through letters, symbols and signs, we get into contact with Klamm, the high official of the castle, but never directly. The castle unfolds its power silently, but nevertheless in extreme violence, without obvious order, but more a kind of sovereign presence within which the villagers fulfil unspoken laws on behalf of the castle and its rules. Still and throughout the novel, K. remains the outsider, the other, he is “treated with condescension, contempt, and outright dislike by the villagers, and allowed only a marginal place in their community as janitor in the village school” (Robertson, 2009: xii).

Whereas this setting may seem obviously ‘Kafkaesque’ at first sight, reminding us of other novels by the author, there are some crucial differences present when encountering the situation at ‘The Castle’, compared to, let’s say, Kafka’s work ‘the Trial’. While in ‘The Trial’, the protagonist is facing a hierarchical authority (there is an obvious similarity between the two books), it is only in ‘The Castle’ that we experience a material and social setting (an experienced and lived ‘everyday’ as we will see in chapter 4). The space and its bodies, or: Junction points), which are going beyond the mere sphere, localization and place of the authority itself, but

\textsuperscript{14} The name of the count is only named once in the novel. Apart from that he remains a nameless, yet even more so, despite his personal invisibility, a present and shaping sovereign. It intensification of the name has been interpreted as an allegory of the administrative or “metaphysical state of “Western” society at the time Kafka composed the novel (Grey et al., 2005: 110).
point to the spatial and political ordering through the rule of law of the constant and continuing production of space (Robertson, 2009).

Kafka’s novel finishes abruptly, while the novel’s protagonist remains in discussion with the female inhabitants of the village at the bottom of the mountain. Kafka is forced to abruptly stop his work, due to health problems, and dies shortly after, before he could finish. How can such a story end? Wagenbach notes, that K. should have died on the 7th day of the novel, of bodily and mental exhaustion, and only then would his eager and sincere behaviour and aspiration, his willingness to fall in, have been validated by an official acceptance (1996: 130), the late arrival of the ‘good’ news being an inclusion through exclusion, So K., until the end, remains a wanderer between two worlds, occupying “a threshold between order and disorder, a threshold, that that we are all sooner or later destined to pass by”, and that K. has been passing throughout the text (ten Bos, 2005: 19), a state which we may seek to escape, but while we are trying “to pull [our] feet out of it, [...] they keep sinking in again” (Kafka, 2009/1926: 13). Hannah Arendt has compared K.’s situation with that of the Jews seeking a place to call home in Europeans states and societies (the book itself being the only book in which Kafka is taking on the Jewish question, as Arendt notes), for example through the heroes constant efforts to become indistinguishable from the villagers15 or his refusal of favours, more generally speaking through the outline and situation in which we find and which are created through the text.

Kafka’s novel is an account for the lived experience of being in space, of being upon a threshold, of being in between and of being orchestrated and organized in this in between and encountering organizational forms, either a hierarchical order itself, or through the reaction to (a submission or a disobedience) the engagement with this higher authority, and to ‘lower’ authorities, who K. often treats dismissively. K. is in a similar position to Brecht’s nameless narrator, notably the feeling of waiting and impatience, yet it is also different: the wheel change seems foreseeable, the higher

15 We will return in more depth to some of these notions, especially when discussing Arendt’s essay “We refugees” (2007/1943).
authority seems to be rather fate, than institutionalized power. K. wants to reach a space of safety, of inclusion, of belonging, yet can only do so by giving name to the processes in which he is finding himself instituted, but largely through removal than inclusion. If organization studies and the theories of organizing remain, as we have seen, to a large extent situated within the boundaries of the 'clean', accessible organization, the official and legitimate organization, I shall in this chapter turn to a philosopher and author, who, for the above stated reasons, remains rather underrepresented and –read in the field of organization studies: Giorgio Agamben ought to be understood as an author, who is not only putting the distinctions of inclusion and exclusion and the powers and forms through which these distinctions are uphold and produced at the centreof his work, but also as one, who can offer a reading of K.’s situation as paradigmatic for the studies of organizations per se.
3.1 On the margins and at the core of Organizations

The work of Giorgio Agamben is better understood as presenting theories with concepts for understanding organization, rather than as a theorist of organization itself or even an organization theorist as Campbell and Munro suggest (2005: 8). Agamben is not a thinker of the organization of the "seemingly well-ordered place" and doesn't — but maybe only at first sight — share an interest in what may be at the heart of thinking organizations (managers and their tasks, workers, hierarchies and bureaucracy, shareholders, system and institutional theory and so forth). But, as I will argue, Agamben's work may be extremely helpful in furthering our understanding of the dark side of organization (Muhr & Rehn, 2014: 226) and, furthermore, open our thinking to different spaces of organizing.

Agamben has not entered the field organization studies to the same extent as other contemporary thinkers and philosophers, who also could be situated within other areas such as sociology, linguistics, philosophy or cultural theory have. There are a few exceptions. René ten Bos sees Agamben’s engagement and interest with the human being (also at the core of any study of organization) as a first entry point for his work in the field (2005: 16). While this is certainly true, I would like to carry the argument a bit further by bringing in his conceptualization of the camp as a space of possibilities for a different politics. This means there are two more points of departure to add, which make his work fruitful for the study of organization: firstly, and as I have hinted at, Agamben's work helps shed light on hidden, 'darker' organizational forms: the prison, the gated community, the camp, hence engaging with the military instead of the manager, the refugee instead of the retailer, the prisoner instead of the (entrepreneurial) pioneer. Secondly, and while doing so, it may also help in seeing the similarities between the 'dark side of organization', as it has been coined, and the seemingly 'normal organization': which logics to be identified within the analyses of, let's say a prison, can be found when closely looking at, let's say, a strategy.
consultancy? How are we to understand the architecture of space and power in a major cooperation and why could the work of Agamben be fruitful in this regard? Can the distinction between the dark and the normal organization be read as more or less constructed and to which kind of question would that lead us? Could for example, and also in light of the discussion on the politics of organizational studies and the stream of literature on engaging the ‘other’ (space, subject or organization itself), the heart of darkness be found in the normal organization. To stay with the literary original, here, isn’t the heart of darkness also within the ivory trader Kurtz and not only deep in the jungle of the Congo at former Stanleyville (Kisangani)? Isn’t the heart of darkness not also embedded in Charles Marlow himself as well in the ivory industry? And isn’t there a clear connection between the (seemingly normal) organization “International Society for the Suppression of Savage Customs” and the report Kurtz is writing for them and his Postscriptum: Exterminate all Brutes? What is at the margins, what is at the core of organization here? Maybe it is the capitalist trading company, situated in the urbanized centres of Europe, which is at the margins, and that means we, at the heart of darkness, together with Kurtz, are at the core of organization (and possibly so, hence: darkness). Joseph Conrad himself hints at this, or, at least, at the impossibility of distinguishing the two, when he lets Marlow reflect upon the infamous lines of Kurtz we have encountered before “The curious part was that he [Kurtz] had apparently forgotten all about that valuable postscriptum [Exterminate all brutes], because, later on, when he in a sense came to himself, he repeatedly entreated me to take good care of ‘my pamphlet’ (he called it), as it was sure to have in the future a good influence upon his career” (1899: 103 – 104). And we may speculate, that it would not have mattered at least (for further elaboration see the discussion under 3.5 - The body and its politics, especially the section on the Muselmann).

With these kind of questions, ones similarly posed by K., Agamben comes to the fore, notably in his Homer Sacer project, in which he studies the unfolding of “an archeology of politics”, indeed detecting and reflecting upon the space on and through which contemporary political power unfolds itself in hidden and obvious ways (Agamben, 2015a). The project is anchored
by repeated inquiries into the means of exclusion and their expression in religious, cenobitic communities, in state apparatus, in mammalian classification systems and so on. In these he shows how through an active concern for ‘other’ kinds of being, we assure ourselves of what remains (the believer, the citizen, the inhabitant, the society, which belongs) of its inclusion (Agamben 2015b: 263ff.). In the State of Exception, for example, Agamben identifies the founding elements of the juridico-political machinery used by western states as a doubling structure, constituted through the juridical in the strict sense, the machine of law, rule and order, the nomos and the extrajuridical and anomic, the latter being used to warrant the existence and management of the former. Relatedly, in his Kingdom and Glory, Agamben identifies glory as an apparatus “directed at capturing within the economic-governmental machine the inoperativity of human and divine life that our culture does not seem to be in a position to think and that nevertheless ceases to be invoked as the ultimate mystery of divinity and power” (2015: 265). In a similar way, an earlier text of Agamben, ‘The open’ has tried to elaborate and the distinction between man and animal as product of the anthropological machine of the west, the anthropozoien project maybe.

Ten Bos notes how Agamben, has, as most organizational scholars, a profound interest in the human being as we heard before, while his interest leads him into a different direction: “The kind of human beings portrayed by Agamben are probably not the kind of human beings you are likely to encounter in and around organizations [...], on the contrary, Agamben’s work seems to focus on those who are, for many different reasons, excluded from these seemingly well-ordered places” (2005: 16, Italics in original). While it is certainly true, that such a reading of Agamben points at this early
stage at a central concept within Agamben’s oeuvre – that of exclusion – I would still argue that it tries to incorporate his philosophical endeavour into the realm of established organization studies, instead of, as I will try, perceived it as an invitation and urge to focus on other loci of organizational force (and well-ordered places these can be). In this sense, the perception of Agamben in Organization Studies remains rather limited. While a certain amount of literature is positioning itself “against” Agamben, for his writings on the governmental machinery only originate in a western school of thought (Liu 2015) or seeks to “resist” him on his account of shame developed in response to the remnants of Auschwitz (Guenther, 2012) others try so to defend his notions, such as Prozorov (2011) writing on Agamben’s terminology of the profanation and the possibility of messianic ideal, those engaging critically with the contemporary aesthetic production of the politics of remembering (McKim, 2011), and those linking his writing to extreme cases of capitalist companies possessing life over death powers (Banerjee, 2008). This rather patchy reception of his work within organization studies is not mirrored in other fields such as legal and political studies. It is in this context that I propose to bring Agamben to bear on the study of the threshold space of the camp, as a thinker almost uniquely capable of offering theoretical framing for an inquiry into what is temporary, evasive and opaque yet also startling present at the same time, for what is dark, brutal and seditious yet also potentially redemptive.
3.2 The Organization of Homo Sacri

"Some day somebody will write the true story of this Jewish emigration from Germany; and he will have to start with a description of that Mr. Cohn from Berlin, who had always been a 150 percent German, a German super-patriot. In 1933 that Mr. Cohn found refuge in Prague and very quickly became a convinced Czech patriot-as true and as loyal a Czech patriot as he had been a German one. Time went on and about 1937 the Czech government, already under some Nazi pressure, began to expel its Jewish refugees, disregarding the fact that they felt so strongly as prospective Czech citizens. Our Mr. Cohn then went to Vienna; to adjust oneself there a definite Austrian patriotism was required. The German invasion forced Mr. Cohn out of that country. He arrived in Paris at a bad moment and he never did receive a regular residence permit. Having already acquired a great skill in wishful thinking, he refused to take mere administrative measures seriously, convinced that he would spend his future life in France. Therefore, he prepared his adjustment to the French nation by identifying himself with "our" ancestor Vercingetorix. I think I had better not dilate on the further adventures of Mr. Cohn"


Their [the Muselmänner’s] life is short, but their number is endless, they, the Muselmänner, the drowned, form the backbone of the camp, an anonymous mass, continually renewed and always identical, of non-men who march and labor in silence, the divine spark dead within them, already too empty to really suffer. One hesitates to call them living: one hesitates to call their death, in face of which they have no fear, as thy are too tired to understand. (Primo Levi, 1959: 103)

Hannah Arendt, in her text “we refugees” introduces to us to Mr. Cohn from Berlin, a Jew in Germany. Mr. Cohn seeks to do everything, like K., to be included wherever he is going. He is not even patriotic, but super patriotic, a 150% German, while later on identifying with the French national hero
Vercingetorix, being self-assured, that his future would lie in France. We do not know how the paradigmatic life of Mr. Cohn has ended and Arendt does not want to speculate on the future of her example of fleeing Jews in the end of the 1930’s, though the implication is he ends up in a camp, one of Levi’s endless numbers.

Primo Levi, the Italian Jew, chemist and resistance fighter against the German occupation has survived Auschwitz concentration camp as a “zombie like existence, before [making] the momentous decision to confront his fearsome memories with the aid of words” (Baily, 2013: xi). And indeed, we cannot read Levi’s texts as he himself points out, as the source of a witness (of what happened on the extermination and concentration camps), but only as “a reconstruction of the past, [...] as an observation that holds for all memories” (2013/1988: 23), for those who could bear witness, are not anymore: “The “true” witnesses, the “complete” witnesses, are those, who did not bear witness and could not bear witness. They are those, who touched bottom: the Muslims (Muselmänner)\(^{18}\), the drowned. The survivors speak in their stead, by proxy, as pseudo-witnesses; they bear witness to their testimony” (Agamben, 1999: 34). We obviously do not know whether Mr. Cohn became one of them, whether Levi speaks also in his stead, yet history has taught us the uncomfoting and horrifying likeliness of such speculation. What we can be more certain of is that it ought to be figures like Cohn of which Agamben speaks, when he talks of homo sacer, beings beyond the law (Zembylas: 2010: 37).

Agamben’s concern throughout his work on the Homo Sacer project can best be summarized as an attempt to understand characteristics of sovereign power in contemporary society (Dean, 2012a: 146).\(^{19}\) Relatedly,

\(^{18}\) It is not entirely clear, why those who are too tired to be afraid of death, those on the margins of life and living have been called and referred to themselves as Muselmänner in concentration camps. Muselmann is an old German word for Muslim indeed. Kogon, prisoner of several concentration camps and one of the first to discuss the institutional logics of the KZ-system has called them „man of unconditional fatalism“ (1974: 400).

\(^{19}\) Especially in the first parts of it Homo Sacer I: Sovereign Power and Bare Life; Homo Sacer II: State of Exception and Homo Sacer III: Remnants of Auschwitz: The witness and the Archive.
one might see Agamben’s attempt as an identification of “defining criteria of modernity and in this sense takes the precedence over other developments such as the secularization of science, the spread of capitalist labour relations or the growth of the nation state” (Gandy, 2006: 500). A way in is provided in Agamben’s discussion of Pompejus Festus who confronts us with a figure of ancient roman law: “The sacred man is the one whom people have judged on account of a crime. It is not permitted to sacrifice this man, yet, he who kills him, will not be condemned for homicide; in the first tribunitian law, in fact, it is noted, that “if someone kills the one who is sacred according to the plebiscite, it will not be considered homicide. This is why it is customary for a bad or impute man to be called sacred” (Festus, quoted in Agamben, 1998: 45). There lies a seemingly odd contradiction in the concept of the homo sacer. On the one hand, he is the sacred man, a holy figure, he cannot be sacrificed to the gods, but his killing is permitted and those who commit such homicide will not be punished. The figure itself points at the ambivalence within the concept of the sacred, as, amongst others, Émile Durkheim has already pointed out in 1912, when he published his work on: Elementary Forms of Religious Life: “So the pure and the impure are not two separate genera but two varieties of the same genus that includes all sacred things. There are two sorts of sacred, lucky and unlucky; and not only is there no radical discontinuity between the two opposite forms, but the same object can pass from one to the other without changing its nature” (1995/1912: 415). The ambivalence of the sacred is embedded in the concept itself, hence the killing can be allowed, while the sacrifice is forbidden, because the human in being declared sacred (the homo sacer) is “simply set outside the human jurisdiction without being brought into the realm of divine law” (Agamben, 1998: 52). They live in-between, manifesting “a double exception”, both from human and divine law, from the sphere of the “profane [politics, the juridical sphere] and from that of religion” (ibid.). As Durkheim remarks: “What makes a thing sacred is [...] the collective feeling of which it is the object” (1995/1912: 416) and what “defines the sacred is that the sacred is added to the real” (1995/1912: 424) begging the question ‘How then, is the sacred added to the real?’ If the sacred can only be defined upon its relation to the real, it must fulfil a political function: “[I]n the figure
of the sacred life, something like a rare life makes its appearance in the
Western World. What is decisive, however, is that from the beginning this
sacred life has an eminent political character and exhibits an essential link
with the terrain on which sovereign power is founded” (Agamben, 1998: 61).
There must be an authority of some sort (religious, political – a sovereign
indeed), who decides upon the sacredness and who can enact the double
exclusion from both the divine and human legal sphere (or subordinate it
onto another one). Therefore, we must engage in more depth into the
discussion of sovereign power and sovereignty, under which circumstances
the possibility of violation without punishment, and hence, Agamben will
argue, the camp, can be created.

3.3 The Production of the State and the
Sovereign

“We are so accustomed to understand legislation (Gesetz), and the law, in
line with the Ten Commandments, as orders and prohibitions, the only
meaning of which is to demand obedience, that we easily allow the original
spatial character of legislation to become forgotten. All legislation creates
first of all a space in which it is valid, and this space is the world in which we
can move in freedom. What lies outside of this space is lawless and properly
speaking without a world”
(Arendt, 2003/1993: 122)

Sovereignty is a “core concept of our moment” (Jennings, 2011: 24).
Jacques Derrida’s lecture on the subject, an attempt to critically establish the
concept into the academic discussion and to think the implications of it, is
not by coincidence called the “Force of law”. Already here, we find a
definition of the law which will be helpful in assessing the politics of
organizing refugees camps: “The very emergence of justice and law, the
instituting, founding and justifying moment of law implies a performative
force [...] The operation that amounts to founding, inaugurating, justifying
law, to making law, would consist of a coup de force, of a performative and
therefore interpretative violence that in itself is neither just or unjust and that no justice and no earlier and previously founding law, no pre-existing foundation, could, by definition, guarantee, or contradict or invalidate" (Derrida, 1989: 241). The performative character of the law, the coup de force Derrida is describing, plays a decisive role in the establishment of both the sovereign as the one who establishes, who enforces the law, as well as in the constructing of the space within which the law unfolds it's power, visibly and less so. Hannah Arendt clearly states law is inherently spatial in itself: the lawless space is without a world; the law and the space it creates are intertwined, they depend on another. Hence it doesn’t come as a surprise that Arendt overwrote her chapter on human rights in the 'The Origins of Totalitarianism' with: the decline of the nation state and the end of human rights. The state is not only the legislative power, but also the guardian of the rights, and without the state the rights cannot be guaranteed. Or, the other way around: without a state, the rights granted to people have a merely ethical inscription, one which may or may not be activated: "no paradox of contemporary politics of filled with more poignant irony than the efforts of well-meaning idealists who stubbornly insist on regarding as “inalienable” those human rights who are enjoyed only by for the citizens of the most prosperous and civilized states and the situation of the rightless themselves” (Arendt, 1958/1951: 279). Arendt contradicts and hence relates the quality of the state to the possibility of the having access to rights, which can be granted. These connections are situated within a development that Arendt describes as the occupation of the state through the nation (Arendt, 1958/1951: 277): The state as both legal and spatial entity becomes occupied with the notion of the belonging to a nation. This then, in its negative mirror, creates the stateless person, the “new category of world population” that Michael Agier (2002: 317) links to displaced persons and refugees. Hannah Arendt has pointed at this development already herself, emphasizing the result of the link between human rights and the nation state for this new category. It is due to this link that the relationship between the state, the sovereign and the space it creates becomes important when analysing the production of refugee camps. Only in understanding the affiliation of these concepts and how they are embodied, one can appreciate
the political implications and unfold the paradoxes, which allow for the becoming a potential political other as we will see later.

“Since the rights of man were proclaimed to be “inalienable”, irreducible to and uneducable from other rights of laws, not authority was invoked for their establishment; Man himself was their source as well as their ultimate goal [...] so it seemed only natural that the “inalienable” would find their guarantee and become inalienable part of the right of the people to sovereign self-government. In other words, man had hardly appeared as a completely emancipated, completely isolated being who carried his dignity within himself without reference to some larger encompassing order, when he disappeared again into a member of a people” (Arendt, 1951/ 1958: 291). The connection between the nation state and the rights of the people is apparent: Without the state, there is no guarantee for the universal rights; the state takes over the role of God, it ”determines who will benefit from the implementation of human rights and that the status of merely being human (as implied by the human rights tradition) is not enough to ensure human rights protection (Lechte & Newmann, 2012: 524).

“Whether God alone is the sovereign, that is, the one who acts as his acknowledged representative on earth, or the emperor, or prince, or the people, meaning those who identify themselves directly with, the question is always aimed at the subject of sovereignty, at the application of the concept, to a concrete situation” (Schmitt, 1985/1922: 10). Carl Schmitt points to two major issues here: Firstly, the form of the sovereign can be tied to manifold actors, as long as the actors hold the power to decide. Secondly, this then leads to an understanding of any order, which is not based on a model, norm, or law, but on a decision itself. “No justice is exercised, no justice is rendered, no justice becomes effective nor does it determine itself in the form of the law, without a decision that cuts and divides” as Derrida puts it (1989: 252).

So we get back to sovereign power: “the state being law in its greatest force” Derrida argues (1989: 268), it must be “law which suspends law” (269): We might also turn to Carl Schmitt here who addressed “the nature of
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sovereignty, the legitimacy of the state, the basis of constitutionality and its relation to the rights and obligations of the individual, the purpose and limits of political power” (McCarthy, 1985: viii).\footnote{Schmitt’s work is contested and (rightfully) critically judged due to in his participation with the National Socialist German Worker Party (NSDAP) between 1933 – 1936 and his endeavour to deliver a theory of the state for the Nazi-regime, “or at least not sunk into depth as he did with the Jewish question” (Schwab, 1985: xiii).} In his book on ‘Political Theology’ Schmitt offers four chapters on the concept of sovereignty – famously beginning with his definition of sovereignty: “Sovereign is he who decides on the exception” (1922/ 1985: 1). And later: “It is precisely the exception that makes relevant the subject of sovereignty, that is, the whole question of sovereignty” (1922/ 1985: 6). In his text on ‘The Concept of the Political’ sovereignty is the name that Schmitt gives to the necessity of the distinction of friend-enemy as reaction and alarm to the ever present possibility of violence.

It is on this basis that Agamben at the beginning of ‘Homo Sacer’ identifies the paradox of the sovereign - standing inside and outside of the law at the same time, or as he puts it: “I, the sovereign, who am outside the law, declare that there is nothing outside the law.” (Agamben, 1998: 17).

The notion of the outside and inside here is not exclusively a legal question; it rather refers to an indeed spatial notion. The outside and the inside are actual; they can be seen, touched, felt, photographed, sketched, walked along, sometimes crossed, but if so always with the acknowledgment of the crossing, since they are real. They describe the borders and boundaries we have come across in the previous chapters. If we are rethinking the situating of the thesis in the current political situation in Europe facing rising numbers of those reaching or trying to reach countries of the European Union as outlined in chapter 1, the link between the legal question and the space again becomes evident: The law is embedded within a space and the driving force of refugees to reach the space of the European Union is a question of reaching a juridical order within. And from the sovereign's perspective, the question of setting itself outside the law, deciding upon the state of exception (through border controls, camps,
asylum centres, walls, fences, guards, etc.) marks precisely the inclusion of everything inside the law by setting itself outside it.

The ontological necessity of the sovereign deciding on the state of exception, and hence on an inside an outside of the law, is marked by the definition of a space in which the law is or can be suspended. This definition then describes the inclusion and the exclusion of those who are falling under the juridical-political order of the sovereign. "The exception is that which cannot be subsumed; it defies general codification, but it simultaneously reveals a specifically juristic element – the decision in absolute purity", hence both norm and decision remain within the juridical-political order and frame (Schmitt, 1922/1985: 11).

Within this thinking of sovereign power and the life it produces organizations are easily, but not exclusively to be understood as spatial, enacted in the form of the camp (Ek, 2006: 363). It is here Agamben's reading of Schmitt in relation to the camp becomes so telling. As Minca has pointed out, a reading of Agamben constitutes an idiosyncratic spatial theory of power, his work on the space of exception and the camp present a distinctive understanding of geographies of modernity (Minca, 2007) in which juridical-political ordering is considered a spatial phenomenon.

The implications of such an understanding of sovereign power as inherently spatial (as being tied to and constituting distinctive space) offers two implications: Firstly, on a methodological level, it encourages us to focus on such spaces of sovereign power, not just for the sake of understanding the unfolding of such power, but finding insights on the implications of this unfolding regarding the politics it needs, the subjects it produces and the ways it is resisted. Secondly, on a theoretical level, it offers us a way of understanding the metamorphoses of such spaces as commonly determined, as driven and produced by the same underlying logics.

Such a spatial reading of the work of Agamben, is not tied to the space of the camp exclusively (even though this the link between the execution of sovereign power and the spatial arrangement in form of the
camp is obvious and plays a foundational role within this work). As Coleman (2008) reminds us, in the work on The State of Exception (2005), sovereign power is not to be read as embodied in form of the camp, but rather as a spatial set of relations of forces of law, yet somehow the camp is that space in which sovereign power is most apparent because the camp is that space which is so obviously exceptional, far more so than the other organizational firms that, in organization studies at least, tend to become the objects of interest:

"We should neither start from the institution (the business firm, the state the empire), because, as we know, institutions are not the source of power relations but rather derive from them (and thus it is not from them which we should start our description of contemporary economy). Yet, these habits and set ways of thinking are so deeply embedded in us that if we don't start from these we likely to give a monodalogy of the [...] contemporary organization and revise some of the fundamental statements about it: first of all, the enterprise does not create its object but the world within which the object exists. And secondly, the enterprise does not create its subjects, but the world within which these subjects exist." (Lazaratto, 2004: 188, Italics in original).
3.4 On the notion of the camp

We are facing a time marked by the "return of the camp" (Huysmans, 2008) (it may have never went away anyhow), or maybe even a time, in which the camp is gaining increasing importance as means and form of separation, exception and rule (as a form and means of organizing indeed, as I have outlined in chapter 2) The Supplicant and the Order). So what of the variety of forms through which they come into being? These varieties of forms of the camp(s) display both the logics, which are inherently inscribed into their composition as well as the space(s) they produce. Finally the question which kind of political subjects, and which kind of politics, are produced by those spaces, and which spaces are vice-versa produced by those subjects which inhabitant and produce the space they live in, lies at the core of this study.

The paradoxical status of the camp, as Agamben shows, arises from the fact, that it is a piece of land within a piece of land from which it is excluded; an entity within another entity, but yet separated from it:

"The camp is a piece of land placed outside the normal juridical order, but it is nevertheless not simply an external space. What is excluded in the camp is, according to the etymological sense of the term exception (ex-capare), taken outside included through its own exclusion. [...] The camp is thus the structure in which the state of exception – the possibility of deciding on which founds sovereign power – is realized normally. [...] The camp is a hybrid of law and fact in which the two terms have become indistinguishable. [...] Whoever entered the camp moved into a zone of indistinction between outside

---

21 Recalling at this moment especially 2.1 Fugatus ante portas, with its presentations and situating of this thesis and 2.3 Organization studies and the organization of the unknown other, including a discussion of the oscillating logics of camp spaces.

22 Lefebvre's notions of abstract space, the everyday, the body and the spatial triad will hopefully prove to be helpful in outlining a general methodological understanding within this thesis as well as laying the ground for reflecting the relationships between the mentioned above notions.
and inside, exception and rule, licit and illicit in which every concepts of subjective right and juridical protection no longer made any sense.”

(Agamben, 1998: 69 – 70, Italics in original)

It is through this paradoxical status, that the camp becomes the space, where the exception is permanently realized – the state of exception is realized normally. “In Germany, the camp has become a permanent reality” (Agamben, 1998: 96). Why? Because here as in other societies and countries the camp emblematizes and encompasses all polarities, the war by which enemies are defined and the humanitarian response by which friendship is realized, the accrual of assets by which elites are structured and the redistribution of wealth by which the poorest are kept in check, segregated, but still belonging (Agier, 2010: 320). The paradoxes, which lie at the core of these structures, cannot be traced back to a simply binary opposition of inside and outside:

“The simple topographical opposition (inside/outside) implicit in these theories [on the state of exception] seem insufficient to account for the phenomenon that it should explain. […] In truth, the state of exception is neither external nor internal to the juridical order and the problem of defining it precisely concern the threshold, or a zone of indifference, where inside and outside do not exclude each other but rather blur with each other. […] Hence the interest of those theories that, like Schmitt’s complicate the topographical opposition into a more complex topological relation […]. In any case, to understand the problem of the state of exception, one must firstly correctly find its localization (or illocalization). As we will see, the conflict over the state of exception presents itself essentially over its proper locus.”

(Agamben 2005: 23 – 24)

The paradoxical status of the camp then is further evoked through an extension of such a binary logic of exclusion or inclusion, “a more complex topology than the inclusion-exclusion division” (Ek, 2006: 366). It is here where Agamben, departing from the conceptual frame set by Carl Schmitt in his understanding of politics, extends the German philosopher's and legal
scholar’s notion, where the exception exposes itself as exclusion. The paradoxes of the camp must be thought of as a tension between the momentum of two political events, one that determines a transformation in the political and legal sphere and a second one that manifests this change.

The discussion of theories and concepts of law under changing political events “is influenced for a time by the practical perspectives of the day” notes Schmitt (1985/1922: 16). The practical perspectives on these “new realities” as well as the question of the timeframe, which sets the boundary not only for the political event, but precisely for the temporal organization it produces lie at the core of an investigation of such problems. If the concept of sovereignty is tied, or even “governed by actual interests” a few points of interest become apparently important and interesting: The question of ‘governing’ is linked to the triad of political subjectivity, power and participation, the question of the ‘actual interest’ again evokes an investigation of the practical perspective guiding these interest and the actors pursuing them. The actor(s) does not mean the state necessarily. As Schmitt notes, the state is the legal order, while under the state of exception the sovereign (or those with granted powers from the sovereign) can enforce the law and set the political stage for whatever action is taken. This state of exception hence represents: “what is outside is included not simply by means of an interdiction or an internment, but rather by means of the suspension of the juridical order’s validity—by letting the juridical order, that is, withdraw from the exception and abandon it. The exception does not subtract itself from the rule; rather, the rule, suspending itself, gives rise to the exception and, maintaining itself in relation to the exception, first constitutes itself as a rule. The particular ‘force’ of law consists in this capacity of law to maintain itself in relation to an exteriority” (Agamben, 1998: 18). So next to the spatial paradox, which is produced through the camp (as an entity within an entity), the paradox relationship of the sovereign is implicit as inside and outside this threshold, the camp then is a space, in which “bare life” and the juridical rule enter into a threshold of indistinction” and this threshold comes into being through the logics described: hence the actual spatial set-up, the
architecture, the borders and boundaries, the fences and walls, the legal inscriptions as the result for the political will for its establishment.

A vast body of literature has been dealing with the conceptualization of the camp as developed by Agamben and referring to the spatialities of camp sides both topologically and topographically. Most of this literature has been focussing on current discussions and developments of contemporary camp and camp like structures and the production of the bare life in the light of the war on terror following the 9/11 attacks. These reflections and discussions are theoretically preoccupied with the camp as (re)appearing paradigm of politics and understand these different forms and types of camps as paradigmatic as with regard to examples such as Guantanamo or Abu-Graiha, or, beyond that, as linguistic practices and means of control and therefore again as paradigmatic for a distinct political order as such (Raulff 2004; Giaccaria & Minca, 2011; Minca 2005, Gregory, 2006; Ek, 2006; Ramadan, 2009; Amoore, 2006; Aradau & van Munster, 2009). These studies do not only account for a reading of the camp as paradigmatic form of political organization in nowadays developments in law, politics and society, but emphasize the spatial aspects of the camp not only as a localisation of such a structures, but for a topographical understanding, a measurement of these spaces, as well as a topological understanding, “an understanding which goes beyond this dimension and extent and opens the gap within which the bare life is produced” (Giaccaria & Minca, 2011: 4). The spatiality of the camp as understood by Agamben unfolds hence in two dimension: the topographical, that which can be measured, counted, geographically traced out or delineated, and the topological, that what is bordered and opened through such space, the logics which are produced and come into being spatially as through the political realities it produces. Under such perspective, the camp is the materialization of the zone of indistinction, in which the opposition between inside and outside, exclusion and inclusion is dissolved or become indistinguishable, hence becoming the state of exception (the nomos, which is characterized precisely through the indistinguishable). It is through these topological implications of the camp that Agamben develops Carl Schmitt’s notion of the state of exception.
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further and complexifies it: Schmitt’s notion of the nomos is that of a spatial ordering, which presents an inclusion of a political space as well as a legal ordering and it is this inclusion of the two within one another, which is prominently embodied in the space of the camp and where one can find both, the processes of law and space actively shaping and constituting society, as well as them being permanently and constantly produced (Bandy & Sibly: 2010). Nomos then is to be understood as “a land based ordering and orientation” (Schmitt, 2006/1974:80).

As Agamben notes, “[...] in contemporary democracies, the creation of laws by governmental decrees that are subsequently ratified by Parliament has become a routine practice. Today the Republic is not parliamentary. It is governmental”. The political implications of such a decrease of democratic legitimation and herein lying possibilities of control, checks and balances become even more apparent with regard to the war on terror as well as to the refugee regime. We therefore have to think the claims and rights which can be ascribed to and taken from the imprisoned, the refugee or immigrant under the light of the state of exception and the sovereign rule which inscribes the imprisoned, the refugee or immigrant into its regime.

The camp as it is being used in the context of this thesis unfolds in two ways: One, it describes an actual space, relating to ethnographic encounters with two actual camps, Buduburam and Oru. In this sense the notion of the camp as developed by Agamben offers a “useful experimental concept” also allowing for revision, criticism and reshaping of the concept itself (Elliot, 2011: 264). Furthermore and more importantly then, an Agambian reading of the camp, also serves as conceptual and theoretical framework guiding a discussion of the inherent logics of such spaces.

The space of the camp comes into being through a land appropriation, Carl Schmitt termed it “Landnahme”, creating a localization without order, the piece of land within a land. What is corresponding here is that the state of exception (“an order without localization”) is enacted permanently in the space of the camp (Agamben, 1998: 99).
That the state of exception since then has become the norm does not only signify that its undecidability has reached a point of culmination, but also that it is no longer capable of fulfilling the task assigned to it by Schmitt. According to him, the functioning of the legal order rests in the last instance on an arrangement, the state of exception, whose aim it is to make the norm applicable by a temporary suspension of its exercise. But if the exception becomes the rule, this arrangement can no longer function and Schmitt’s theory of the state of exception breaks down. In this perspective, the distinction proposed by Benjamin between an effective state of exception and a fictitious state of exception is essential, although little noticed. It can be found already in Schmitt, who borrowed it from French legal doctrine; but this latter, in line with his critique of the liberal idea of a state governed by law, deems any state of exception which professes to be governed by law to be fictitious.

The camp embodies and exemplifies how exception becomes the rule. Part three of Agamben’s work *Homo Sacer: Sovereign Power and Bare life* is overwritten as ‘[T]he camp as bio-political paradigm of the modern’. Within this final chapter of the book, Agamben shows the processes of the exertion of sovereign power, leading to the creation of bare or sacred life as an originally biopolitical mean of politics. The final subchapter is famously called: The camp as nomos of modernity: “What happened in the camps so exceeds the juridical concept of crime that the specific juridico-political structure in which those events took place is often, simply omitted from consideration: “[T]he camp is merely the place in which the most absolute condition inhumana that has ever existed on earth was realized.” (Agamben, 1998: 95). This opening follows a description of the practices of Versuchspersonen (subchapter 5 on Versuchspersonen, human guinea pigs) as a way of understanding the new biopolitical paradigm which found place in the concentrations camps of the National-Socialistic German state. The Versuchspersonen and the experiments, conducted on them (experiments on rescue operations from high altitude, experiments on the survival in ice-cold water, or experiments with fever bacteria and viruses) show two things. First, they were "persons sentenced to death or detained in a camp, the entry into
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which meant the definite exclusion from the political community”. Secondly, those “who were sentenced to death and those who dwelt in camps in the camps are thus in some way unconsciously assimilated to homines sacri, to a life that may be killed without the permission to homicide” (Agamben, 1998: 91).

In the following chapter on the “Politicizing Death”, Agamben takes a closer look at post-world war II biopolitics (the regulation of both individual and then species bodies, the former with disciplinary inscriptions to make the body more productive and obedient say, the latter with active management of life flows using statistical summaries of mortality rates, disease incidence, life expectancy etc. (see Foucault, 1992: 13), more specifically a wavering zone of death beyond coma in modern hospital settings, concluding, that “the hospital room in which […] the overcomatose patient waver[s] between life and death also delimits a space of exception, in which a purely bare life, entirely controlled by man and his technology, appears for the first time.” (1998: 94) Agamben’s view of the camp is of an intensification and merger of these biopolitical forces: constrictions and conscription of the body merge with overt systems of human measurement, a reduction of lives to how they might be processed through management and regulations that collapse what is lived and lively into what is broken in. The politicization of life, which Agamben detects in modern democracies, exceeds the rhetorics of Nazi-eugenics and politics. As Maurizio Lazzarato reminds us, mechanisms of control and surveillance are not only exercised through the cruelly active moulding of brains and bodies (as in the Nazi camps), but also through what he calls “old’ disciplinary dispositifs” (italics in original), the modulation and governing of the bodies themselves and their inscription into the political realm as objects of power (2004: 191). These mechanisms, which appear almost ancient from a perspective driven by an analysis of contemporary forms of control and moulding in western societies, display an apparent and obvious form of inscribing the life of camp inhabitants into the logics of a place such as a camp. The means and forms of governing refugees and (internally) displaced people and preventing movement of (forced) migration range from border controls, the regulation through legal documents and
resident statuses, the issuing of identity cards and identity numbers, maintaining immigrants in camps, asylum and temporary holding centres. These variations offer a range of inscription upon the paradigmatic body, formed and shaped through disciplines, into the discourses of the practice of the camp, representing a "body and a soul marked by signs, words, images registered in us in the same way that Kafka’s machine of ‘prison colony’ grafts its commands on the skin of the condemned." (Lazzarato, 2004: 191).

What is produced through these mechanisms as bios and subject is the naked life, or as Suely Rolnik described it the ‘rubbish subjectivity’ (Lazzarato, 2004).

We have to return to the notion of the nomos here once more, for “every new age and every new epoch in the coexistence of peoples, empires and countries, of rulers and power formations of every sort, is founded on new spatial divisions, new enclosures, and new spatial orders of the earth (Schmitt, 2005/1974: 79). If the state of exception is realized in the camps as “[a] precise area in which the normal legal order [is] suspended” (Schmitt, 2005/1974: 99), we have to turn to Agamben’s reading of the camp as the nomos of modernity: The camp as paradigmatic political space of our times is the result of a permanent crises of the political system of modern nation-states, to which the states react in undertaking “the management of the biological life of the nation directly as its own task” (Agamben, 2000a: 42).

The camp then becomes both “the new, hidden regulator of the inscription of life in the order", as well as “the sign of the system’s inability to function without being transformed into a lethal machine” (Agamben, 1998: 112). It is on this basis, that we can nowadays witness the transformation of the temporal suspension of law in form of the state of exception into a stable order and spatial arrangement.

Agamben's notion of camps as paradigmatic for our times and camp space as a stable and spatially realized state of exception threaded by
biopower, provides a provocative framing for an empirical study, which is, as Humphreys (2005: 1) remarks, something largely lacking in Agamben.\textsuperscript{23}

\textsuperscript{23} Agamben though has defended himself against such critique, by clarifying his writings and the use of the notion of paradigm as “neither universal, nor particular, [but as] a singularity, which produces a new ontological context” (Agamben, 2002b: 4) and which is rather analogical, than deductive or inductive.
4 The Spaces and its Bodies

Through me the way is to the city dolent;
Through me the way is to eternal dole;
Through me the way among the people lost.
Justice incited my sublime Creator;
Created me divine Omnipotence,
The highest Wisdom and the primal Love.
Before me there were no created things,
Only eterne, and I eternal last.
“All hope abandon, ye who enter in!”
These words in sombre colour I beheld
Written upon the summit of a gate;
Whence I: “Their sense is, Master, hard to me!”
And he to me, as one experienced:
Here all suspicion needs must be abandoned,
All cowardice must needs be here extinct.
We to the place have come,
where I have told thee
Thou shalt behold the people dolorous
Who have foregone the good of intellect.
(Dante, 2003/1320, Canto III)

Dante leads the way deep into the circles of hell. In the 3rd Canto of the first part of his Divine Comedy, we are standing at the gates of the Inferno together with Dante himself lead by the poet Vergil. And after entering we are in a space full of caves and cages, circles separating realms from another, yet connected, a world turned upside down, literally and metaphorically. A space as a multitude of spaces inhabited and shaped by the bodies and souls of murders and thieves, traitors, false believers and rapist. Dante structures hell in nine circles, each reserved for a specific sin (limbo, lust, gluttony, greed, wrath, heresy, violence, fraud, treachery), concentric spaces, representing a static increase in the badness of sin before
arriving at the centre of hell. Before the sixth circle, Dante and Vergil enter the city of Dis (an ancient name for the roman god Pluto, god of the dead, the afterlife and the underworld), a space of towers and walls, guarded by fallen angels, buildings, houses and streets, an antipode to the idea of the heavily city. Inferno, to introduce some concepts, which we will further discuss within the following sections, is a space of abstraction, of ordering and control, as much as it is a lived space of everyday experiences, routines and actions, which are guided and shaped, ordered and orchestrated by intellection, which serves as a respective and overall framing. The lives lived and suffered here are alienated from all humanity, the loss of the later is the punishment for the sins that have been committed. The entry point, the gate at which we are finding Dante and Vergil, which is so famously marked by the words \textit{“All hope abandon, ye who enter in!”} is a junction point, a place of passage and encounter, which marks a boundary and forbids excess (for the living) and which can only be entered on special occasion or special permission (and indeed Dante can only find his way inside by being accompanied by Vergil).

Agamben, as we have learnt, invites us to examine and expose our research and thinking to places such as Dante’s inferno. It is through his project on the ‘Homo Sacer’, that we can allow ourselves to be exposed and get in contact with the circles and divisions of the inferno(s) of our time and the ideas and concepts which mark their logics. But whereas Vergil serves not only as an intellectual guiding figure for Dante in the Divine Comedy, but also represents the guide himself, he who can lead the way and, knowing where to set the foot and which way to take once inside hell, we lack such a guide to understanding the routines and logics, the potentially heterogeneous and messy ways of how these spaces come into being in their actuality. As we have seen: if we read Agamben’s oeuvre spatially, if space serves not only as a guiding concept in itself through his work, but also as the way to apply his analysis, then we are on our own a little, as, in making us

\[24\] This is just the first of other gates we will come across in this thesis which are marked by the symbol and sign of language (see also beginning of Chapter 6) Producing Paradoxes and the Possibilities of Politics
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think of the camp, and so providing a conceptual frame for the research questions concerning the nature of refugees, how they are organized and in turn organize, then Agamben makes us think of these questions spatially, without providing any empirical guide. We lack a Vergil figure. So is there such, a figure who, before getting to the empirical study of space, helps us appreciate, in the spirit of Agamben, that space is not ‘out there’ as such, but emerges in the very act of inquiring into (as well as occupying and designing and managing) it. So how to come to terms with this scene of on-going, collective and multiple creation of space in use? One response is to reach for the work of Henri Lefebvre whose lifetime of inquiry into space, into its organization, production, dissolution, allows us to better appreciate how space remains always intimate to the processes of its production, yet can also be approached as such, and analysed. It is here, I argue, we find our Vergil figure, someone whose work organizes our understanding of space, without organizing space itself. Lefebvre has been used in organization studies, but not extensively, and where he has it is typically by invoking the conceptual triad of perceived, conceived and lived space. In relation to Agamben’s concept of the camp, and more broadly the questions of refugees and organization, I look to Lefebvre’s triadic conception of space as conceived, perceived and lived, and then to a comparably underrepresented concept of Lefebvre: Abstract space.
4.1 Spatializing Organizations

For Lefebvre, any directed action such as a decision is spatial, as it is question of having a stake, that which is both a goal and a claim, for which we struggle (Lefebvre, 1991/1974: 410). This is especially the case with the struggle of sovereignty with which Agamben was concerned, and by which the camp was organized as a space of exception:

“Sovereignty implies ‘space’ and what is more it implies a space against which violence, whether latent or overt, is directed – a space established and constituted by violence” (Lefebvre, 1991: 280).

Such an understanding of space as being the upshot of decision (in the case of sovereignty to determine a state of exception with regard to the housing and ordering and scripting of certain peoples) leads us to two underlying premises which this thesis rests on: Firstly: the spatial processes which lead to the constant production of space (and its changes) are a source of information and material for itself, these processes lead to an understanding which can never be finalized, but hint at underlying principles for the construction of these spaces and help explain the politics and social dimensions which are interdependent and referential to its spatial production. These processes then are, as Soja points out, indeed “a source for explanation in itself “(Soja, 2000: 11; Italics in original). Secondly, with space being a tool for thought and action, spatial processes must be understood as inherently social or political: An understanding of space as inherently social (political) means any set of social relations, processes need to be spatially inscribed, embedded and performed in order to become real. Politics, for example, does not come into being solely through action (elections, legislation, resistance or revolution, dictatorial decisions and so forth), but is always embedded, expressed, defined and made through symbols, practices, architecture and spatial ordering (Lefebvre, 1991/1974: 245). Space as conceptually developed in the oeuvre of Lefebvre is far more
than a strictly geometrical, Euclidean notion (space as a measurable and homogeneous unit and unity), it is socio-spatial indeed (Beyes & Steyaert, 2012: 1). Indeed, as de Certeau reminds us when defining space, “space is a practiced place”, a geometrical and planned unit, street, square, house, city, a camp teeming with life and full of social practices, “actuated by the ensemble of movements deployed within it” (1989: 117).

For this reason, the notion of ‘space’ has gained importance in organization theory over recent years – as a mode of describing power relations, the architecture of organizations, as a way through which to resist and re-organize, amongst others. van Marreweijk and Yanow (2010) call this development the spatial turn in organization studies, where the thinking of space as organization and organization as space creates an appreciation of space intertwined with organizational politics (Beyes & Steyeart, 2012). Indeed: acknowledging the interdependencies between space, knowledge, hierarchy, politics and power means thinking spatially is almost unavoidable in organization studies (Soja, 2000: 282). Space then is far more than a “fundamental metaphor in socio-political thought” (Stavrakakis, 2011: 301). It is where organization occurs, both in creation and dissolution (Lefebvre, 1991/1974: 365).

In this growing awareness of space it is Henri Lefebvre’s book ‘The Production of space’ published in 1974 that remains a grounding work for interlinking organizational politics to spatial production allowing organizational scholars to understand the spatial expression of political forces in and through organizations. It is worthwhile noting that Lefebvre’s intellectual interest, expressed also, but not exclusively, in his work on space, may best be summarized as an engagement with the alienating powers in contemporary capitalism (Elden, 2001; Shields, 1998; Wilson, 2011 & 2013a)25. This has meant his work being picked up in two broad discussions within organization studies and theory (widely understood). First, a post-

25 This may also explain the absence of the space of the camp within the writings of Lefebvre, while putting the interest in the capitalist city and the question of alienation.city up front, in which the ‘transformation of the space is dominated through a change in the mode of production (Lefebvre, 1977, 2003: 88)
structuralist reading of Lefebvre occurring largely in geography and urban studies (presented e.g. through the work of urban theorist Edward Soja 1989, 1996), emphasizing the material over the forms of their representations, and second a Marxist reading (presented through the work of the urban theorist David Harvey 1982, 1989, 1990), postulating an more idealistic understanding.

Lefebvre, considered himself a Marxist (and not much less: a Hegelian and Nietzschean and Heideggerian) writer and reader, or at least concerning the first, a writer engaging with the problems and possibilities of Marxist philosophy and Marxist-Leninist practices (Kipfer, Saberi & Wieditz, 2012: 117). His concerns with Marxism are present throughout his work and his engagement with Marx, next to Hegel and Nietzsche and also Heidegger form an entry- and departure point for his thinking (Elden, 2003a: 3).26 This needs acknowledging and to follow the tradition of intellectual development, I begin with a short note on Lefebvre’s reading of Hegel, for it is interlinked with and enriching for his understanding of Marx.

The modern world”, Lefebvre writes, “is Hegelian” (Lefebvre 2003/975: 42). It is only on this basis, that we can engage for example with the concept of the nation state, for it was Hegel who has “asserted the state’s supreme and value” (ibid..). Hegel’s importance for Lefebvre, is the sense of such entities as states being dialectical in their nature, and our understanding of them too, as we find the mind obliged “to move from one position it had hoped was definitive and to take account of something further, thereby denying its original assertion…” (Lefebvre, 2009/1940: 19). The sense of dynamic motion is palpable, and alluring, but where Hegel errs for Lefebvre is its unreality, the lack of the world and its suffering: the “Hegelian universe […] is nothing more than the world of the metaphysician Hegel, the creature of his own speculative ambition”.27 And in reaction to it, Lefebvre laconically notes: “… life goes on.” (ibid: 46). Enter Marx, who

---

26 Lefebvre himself suggest to study Hegel, Marx and Nietsche together (2003/1975:44)
27 And in an early text from 1939, Lefebvre concretizes his critique: “The Hegelian mind always remains oddly narcissist and solitary. In its contemplation of itself it obscures the living beings and dramatic movements of the world” (2003/1939: 21).
leads the way out, into the “modern world [which] is Marxist” (2003/1975: 42). Rational planning, the allocation of resources, the changes of societies and belief systems, the traces of the capitalist mode of production have shaped and changed our societies, “which is more or less what Marx foresaw and predicted” (ibid.: 42). Yet even here Lefebvre was not totally persuaded, as Coleman (2013: 357) points out: “equally, as conventionally practiced, Marxism shies away from wonder, prompting Lefebvre to theorize a sociology inspired by Marx.”28 So Lefebvre wishes to appreciate life dialectically, to sense the pervasiveness of capitalist ordering, and to preserve a poetic and mythic sensitivity (Lefebvre, 1968: 87-88) emphasizing that truth could only be preserved through its transformation (Lefebvre 1968/1940).

Hence the influence first of Nietzsche, not least his “obstinate defense of civilization against the state, social and moral pressures”, and second of Heidegger’s critique of abstract technocratic representations29 (2013: 366). Elden has pointed to a related influence of Heidegger’s thinking of the intimate relationship between space and, so as relational categories through which “the reassertion of space within social theory can neither be at the expense of time, nor allow space to be assimilated into an otherwise unproblematised historical method” (2005: 821). Furthermore, Lefebvre’s interest in the everyday life can be traced back to Heidegger’s notion of everydayness (Alltaglichkeit) – as part of the “continuous debate with Heidegger” (Sünker, 2014: 334) – a debate in which Lefebvre is nevertheless critical: the idea of Alltaglichkeit as espoused by Heidegger tended to regard the everyday as somewhat habituated and humdrum, a mundane condition that can be transformed by only a few, whereas Lefebvre found the possibility in the many (Gardiner, 2012: 50).

28 Taking Marx as an encouragement to engage openly and self-critically over time with a distinct (even though) broad research interest, may be the best way to characterize Lefebvre’s reading of him and helps explain his lifelong interest in the processes which organize our world: “This complex content of life and consciousness is the true reality which we must attain and elucidate. Dialectical materialism is not an economicism. It analyses relations and then reintegrates them into the total movement.” (Lefebvre 2009/1940: 73).
29 For a more in depth discussion of abstraction and abstract spaces and violent forms of representation, see 4.4 Abstract Spaces.
Often these influences in Lefebvre’s work are overlooked, not least in the post-structural uses which tend to emphasize the triadic conception of space into perceived, received and lives space. This has meant for a somewhat static use of his work, as though these three elements of space were somehow separable, when clearly given the background in dialectics, in evaluative and politically charged analysis, and a willingness to stay with the open and fluid nature of everyday life, Lefebvre’s sense of space is as an entirely relational and dynamic production which is all in process, with nothing fixed about it all. It is perhaps with his work on the city and conceptualizing the city that this can best be appreciated. By examining this it is then possible, I argue, to transpose such an appreciation onto an analysis of the concept of the camp offered by Agamben.
4.2 The Social Production of Space and the Everyday

"Knowledge falls into a trap when it makes representations of space the basis for the study of 'life', for in doing so it reduces the lived experience."

(Lefebvre, 1991: 230)

Already at the beginning of industrialization, "the city is a powerful reality", producing and accumulating not only money, but also technology and knowledge (Lefebvre, 1996: 66), entangled in a double process between "industrialization and urbanization, growth and development, economic production and social life" (ibid.: 70). As it develops, though, Lefebvre acknowledges a distinction between 'the city' and 'the urban', where 'the city' represents bounded, traditional cityhood, in contrast to 'the urban' or urban society, which is much more diffuse and attenuated (Madden, 2012: 779). In this light, Lefebvre argues that there has been a shift "from the city to urban society" (2003), a shift which may be denoted by the history of space and the transformation from natural to absolute to abstract spaces. Nowadays it is the urban that is the field in which society is at once coordinated and managed and at the same time the space for lived experiences, a place and ground for struggle of part-taking, to be citizen indeed (Fernandes, 2007). Hence, "Henri Lefebvre identifies the urban with the sociospatial form of centrality [...] The urban as centrality is thus not easily identifiable. Not reducible to physical markers (density, particular characteristics of the built environment), it must 'live' through social practice" (Kipfer, Saberi & Wieditz, 2012: 119). The urban is not something, but an endless process of production, almost like an art form, being produced by citizens (linked or even tied to a certain city- or nation-space), but more widely by human beings, gathered around and embedded forms of centrality.\footnote{6 out of 10 refugees are living in urban areas by the end of 2015 (UNHCR, 2016). Relating to this development (a continuing trend towards the urban since 2008) is an on-going debate about the emerging or already realized indistinguishability between refugee}
the city and the messier, fragmented, frame of the urban hence can be seen
as the starting point for Lefebvre’s interest in space more generally: “The city
and the widening of urban sphere are thus the setting of struggle; they are
also, however the stake of the struggle” Lefebvre notes (1991/1974: 386).

So we learn from Lefebvre that space is not only a social product, a
lived experience in itself, it is also a struggle, open-ended, and is constituted
in all walks of life taking place within processes of urbanization from the 19th
century onwards: “we have passed from the production in space to the
production of space itself” (Lefebvre, 2009/1979:186). Lefebvre calls it the
generalized explosion of space, marked by increasing globalization (Lefebvre
would have coined it ‘mondalisation’, a term translated by Stuart Elden as
“making worldly – a process or event” (2003b:164), naming the occupation
and use of spaces through the movement of goods and services and hence
enforcing a transformation, then, a rapid expansion of those forces which
seek to control and manage the ever-growing urban environments, and then
through the realization of people, acknowledging that wherever they engage
in space (their home, the school, the office, the fabric and the assembly line,
the so-called public space), they engage in social relations and practices
(Lefebvre, 2009/1979: 191f.) Space is shaped and made, reused and altered
through the practices of those who take part in being in and through space.
To change society, to change life itself, we need to produce (if necessary:
change) space (Lefebvre 2009/1979: 186).

Hence what is other to the space is always part of that space, its possible
transformation is to be thought within and along any analysis of what is
therein constituted. Space then is always also the “tool for thought and
action (Lefebvre 1991/1974: 26), “the centres, the privileged places, the
cradles for thought and invention” (Lefebvre 2003/1986: 208). If one is to

---
camps and city spaces. Refugee camps as often long lasting, supposed, solution often qualify as city spaces, due their infrastructure and urban features and facilities. See for example (Al-Qutub, 1989; Shiblak, 1997; De Montclos & Kagwanja; 2000; Agier, 2002; Misselwitz, 2009; Rueff & Viaro, 2009; Sanyal, 2011; Dalal, 2015). The increasing scholarly interest, but most importantly, the actual development allows us to refer to Lefebvre’s notion of on-going processes of urbanisation, as he did to Marx when discussing the all-embracing effects of capitalist societies: [it] is more or less what Lefebvre foresaw and predicted.
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think space as social product, such thinking invites and allows for re-narrating and re-establishing the relationships between society and the architecture and planning in which it is embedded and which it is shaping, as "effect, cause and reason". This mutual relationship between the two (space and society) allows for space to change and alter whenever society is changing (Lefebvre 2003/1986: 209). Indeed, Lefebvre inscribes (social) space as inevitably encountering and facing its own ontological duality, which is inscribed into its production: On the one hand the space as "field for action (offering its extension to the deployment of projects and practical intentions) and a basis for action (a set of places whence derive and whither energies are directed)" (Lefebvre, 1991/1974: 191). Space always is messy hence, at once a collection and assemblage of materials, time, movements, actualities and potentialities. And still, space as socially produced is not endless, it resides and constitutes within borders and boundaries (which may be resisted or altered potentially), which results in various kinds of space:

1) “Accessible Space for normal use: routes followed by riders or flocks, ways leading to fields and so on. Such use is governed prescriptively – by established rules and practical procedures.

2) Boundaries and forbidden territories – spaces to which access is prohibited either relatively (neighbours and friends) or absolutely (neighbours and enemies).

3) Place of abode, whether permanent or temporary

4) Junction points: these are often places of passage and encounter; often too, access to them is forbidden except on certain occasions for ritual import – declarations of war and peace, for example."

(Lefebvre 1991/1974: 193)

As an example imagine a school as social space: There are gates and walls around it (boundaries and marking it as forbidden territory for those not affiliated with the institution), yet it is an accessible space for its normal users (teachers, janitors and pupils, occasionally parents and relatives), it can be a place of abode (as boarding school for example, both temporarily for students and permanent, for teachers living there) and it can also be a
junction point, a place as passage of encounter, say when it opens it gates on an unregular day (a Saturday or Sunday for graduation celebrations or the welcoming of new students), when it opens normally inaccessibly places within the institutions for similar occasions (the teachers room, the auditorium) or when the space is used differently authorized and managed by political and administrative elites (e.g. the accommodation of refugees in sport halls). It is through these practices and possibilities that we understand space as social product, in its various kinds as well as through the relationship between this space and society and also both an invitation and remainder, that “we are workers, producing our own factory just by walking down the street” (Muschamp, 2006: xiii).

So in relation to the camp we gain in Lefebvre a possible guide to how it casts upon us and constitutes the means and end of social control, domination and power, forces that are very apparent, but which cannot control and maintain space as an entity entirely for their own purposes, there is always a spilling over, an eruptive dialectic within the everyday which admits of no historical end. To Lefebvre, “the thinker, who, consistent with the description of Marx is a thinker of the possible”, it is the everyday that holds the possibility of pointing to and allowing for possible alternative futures, “pointing beyond the extant [...] and holding the prospect for “organizing social time and space” in “more democratic, egalitarian and progressive ways” (Brenner & Elden, 2009: 39). He is warning those who analyse space not to lose sight of what is ordinary in all its strangeness or mundaneness, not to abstract out of it, sacrificing an awareness of what is being lived to an interest in formally identified organizations, and thereby also to the concepts of theory.

The everyday, he argues, is “a level of contemporary society defined by 1) the gap between this level [of the everyday] and the level above (those of the state, technology, high culture); 2) the intersection between the non-dominant sector of reality and the dominant sector; 3) transformations of objects into appropriated goods” (Lefebvre 2003/1962: 100). Lefebvre offers a definition of the everyday, consisting of three levels: “The immaterial
and natural forms of necessity (needs, cyclic time scales affective and vital spontaneity) as well as the seeds of the activity by which those forms are controlled (abstraction, reason, linear time), it [further and secondly] encompasses the regions where objects and good are continually appropriated, where desires are elaborated from needs and where goods and desires correspond, the realm of the dialect between alienation and belonging and [thirdly] as set of practices, representation, norms and techniques, established by society itself to regulate consciousness, to give some order – an ambiguous realm for this social control is sometimes played with, subverted and disobeyed " (2008/1961: 62; Italics in original). In line with such an understanding and emphasizing the ambiguity, the everyday is a space in which the possible is confronted with the impossible as well as the actual. Relatedly he notices how the (practices of) everyday life often stand in contrast to and contravene the more hierarchical, economically or politically organized life, how "political life suppresses its own conditions, which is to say everyday life [...] the life of real individuals" (77). 31 Politics (and their representatives: political and economic elites, planning and management departments) is not able and willing to understand and engage progressively and open with the everyday social, political and spatial processes of their inhabitants (the state as spatial entity) and citizens (the space as political and legal entity), while it "assert itself over the banal life [...] the everyday life in general" (Lefebvre, 2009/1964: 77).

While this study of the everyday is an attempt to critically engage with the functions and underlying premises of the logics of the socialist state in the mid 20st century, (the Soviet Union in particular) and the reason identified for such lack of interest and willingness (indeed and again: the separation of the everyday from politics) is the declaration of the permanence of its own revolution, it can be read as much more than just a critique of the practices and premises of the Marxist Leninist state. If we were to swap, for example, the wording ‘the permanence of its own

31 These real individuals potentially can become to (the Marxist Lefebvre) the “total man, the free individual in a free society [...] The total man is the de-alienated man.” (Lefebvre, 2009/1940: 163).
revolution' with the nowadays prominent claim of 'the political necessities without alternatives' we get a hint at a similar logic of detaching political action and thinking from needs and necessities, wishes, and most importantly, practices and engagements of citizens and inhabitants. Most importantly, not only, but indeed definitely in the context of this thesis, for those on the margins and the outside, included, as we have seen only through an exclusion; refugees, migrants, the unknown other. The undertaking of the state(s) to exclude the messiness of the banal and everyday (of their own citizens and inhabitants, of those who are the other, the necessary other potentially, but also for the sake of creating a homogeneous self) is, Lefebvre (2009/1975) suggests, therefore precisely based on the idea of homogeneity, disallowing and disapproving of any disturbance (enrichment) of the processes of organized politics.

Thus he offers us an alternative in the turn to self-organization and production, to a taking part of those who have no part, a heterogeneity disturbing the homogeneous role of the political organization exercised by officials, the administrations and management systems, and in relation to the camps these systems include those of NGO's. While as this form of self-organizing could be read as "the determining role of social movements" (Lefebvre, 2009/1979: 193), the importance and stress of the argument lies again in the role that an exercise of everyday life practice might have in shaping, resisting and changing politics from within and hence beyond a defined area called the camp (with its junction points, accessible space, its places of abode and its boundaries). Looking at, listening to and searching beyond the realm of the orders, laws32, hierarchies, established rules, right at the heart of this camp life, we might find unforeseen conditions on how the politics of the space are being shaped in different possibilities of participation, where participation is not foreseen (Lefebvre, 2009/1979: 206), and which then give us a rich insight into how through the space of the

---
32 As with regard to the moment of justice, Lefebvre notes: "Justice and Judgement are not formed by nature, but by civilized man. [...] The moment of justice is also defined by a form, a procedure,: summons, courts appearance, testimony, and cross-examination, indictments, pleas, deliberation, application of the law, sentence and the execution of the sentence" (2003/1959: 168-169), or: socio-spatial processes.
camp refugees are being organized and organizing. To Lefebvre for sure, and this is one of the major reasons why his work is being introduced in the context of this thesis, space is much more than just a defined set of social relations and established political hierarchies, but always as well and through the everyday practices, a possibility of action and alternative, an active and open environment to disturb prominent and prevailing logics (Lefebvre 1991/1974: 11), a "Third space of political choice" (Soja, 1996: 35; italics in original)
4.3. Organizing Space:
On perceived, conceived, and lived Spaces

“In our societies, there is a problematic of space (conceptual and theoretical) and an empirically observable practice”

(Lefebvre, 2009/ 1973: 197)

Now that we have gained an understanding of space as social product (as both, socially producing and, as "network of exchanges and flow(s) of raw materials and energy" (Lefebvre, 1979: 287)) and the role which everyday practices and uses play, when potentially altering and changing dominant politics of such spaces, we are still left wondering how methodologically to understand and grasp the dynamic and complex relationships unfolding in the production of space.

“The more carefully one examines space, considering not only with the eyes, not only with the intellect, but with all senses, with the total body, the more clearly one becomes aware of the conflicts at work within it, conflicts, which foster the explosion of abstract space and the production of a space that is other" (Lefebvre, 1991/1974: 391).

Understanding, as I have outlined, space (any space, and indeed: the space of the camp) as one of struggle (and hence allowing for thinking and seeing ‘the other’ within) calls for modes of inquiry through which to see and reflect upon the contradictions, which are embedded within the production of (the) space (of the camp). Most obviously Lefebvre offers a triad of analytical and conceptual frames that help making sense and yet still grasp the complexity of space (Lefebvre, 1991/1974: 33). They are three ‘parts’ of the same space, connected and interrelating with each other, depended and yet differentiable from one another. These are ‘lived’, ‘perceived’ and ‘conceived’ space, coming into being through one another and constantly (re)-creating space through the heterogeneous relationship. They are never at once, but always intertwined and mutually changing, referring and pulling on one
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another, they “aren’t ever stable, nor should they be grasped artificially or linearly” (Merrifield, 2006: 111):

Firstly, what one might consider a hierarchical space, the space of dominant powers and structures is described as conceived space, understood as a space of certain representational practice, a practice imposing an order and (con)frontal relations. Lefebvre describes it as the dominant space within every society, as the space, which prescribes politics, and ideology, which seeks homogeneous renderings of all aspects of life, “intimately tied to relations of production and to the ‘order’ those relations impose, and hence to knowledge, to signs, to codes, to ‘frontal’ relations” (1991/1974: 33).

These representations of space refer to the logics of bureaucrats and technocrats, embodying and representing the ideas of the political, economic and social elite, of urban planners, architects, members of International Organizations or Non-Governmental Organizations, presidents and advisors. Representations of space, as the space of power in whichever society, plays a “substantial role and specific influence in the production of space” (Lefebvre, 1991/1974: 42), finding “objective expression”, for example in the planning of cities and the structures they imply (streets, squares, centres, areas and so forth), and in the “bureaucratic and political authoritarianism immanent to a repressive space” (Lefebvre, 1991/1974: 49), a space “which has nothing innocent about it” (Lefebvre, 1991/1974: 40; 360). Applied to the body it would be the space defined by scientific categories associated with organs, illnesses, collective drives, gender ascriptions and life expectancy rates. If we apply a Foucauldian term here, conceived space is the dominant discourse of space in a given society whose ‘representations’ are abstract, but which have a substantial and decisive role in the production of space through social and political practices (Simonson 2005: 7).

Secondly, tight to a terminology borrowed from Noam Chomsky, spatial practices also imply a level of competence and a specific level of performativity for members of any given the society within any distinctive space. Such perceived space “embraces production and reproduction and the particular locations spatial sets characteristics of each social formation”
(Lefebvre, 1991/1974: 33). Spatial practices can be understood as a continuity of the social, as the perception of the everyday of space and for ensuring social ordering and order within society. Lefebvre remains rather vague as with regard to his elaboration on spatial practices, but we might understand it as something intermediate between conceived and lived spaces, which do not only stay in sharp contrast to each other, but are negotiated through the perception of representations of space (also for example through art and artistic practices, 1991/1974: 33) as a basis for understanding the outside world. Again, Lefebvre compares it with the use of the body when perceiving and registering the outside world: The hands which touch and the feet which walk on the ground, the nose which smells, the eyes that see and the ears that hear and explore the surrounding outside (1991/1974: 40).

Thirdly, comes the space of the underground (Lefebvre, 1991/1974: 22), the lived space, the space of the everyday experience we have discussed above: “An overlay of physical space, making symbolic use of its objects (1991/1974: 39). Rather than represented spaces (conceived space), the lived space is more akin to spaces of re-presentation, “the café on the corner, the block facing the park, the third street on the right after the Cedar Tavern, near the post office” as Merrifield notes (2006: 110). Lived spaces are “spaces that take their shape literally through the daily routines of their users. […]. Such spaces may be public or private; they may overlay or disrupt the dominant spaces, or indeed they may take shape alongside them” (1994: 454). Here, again in relation to the body, if the first space represents how the body is measured, and the second how it moves, here we have a sense of the everyday mood by which the body apprehends and encounters life, it is the most poetic of spaces.

These concepts are inherently intertwined and cannot be separated from one another. Through the conceptualisation alone as a triad of concepts this become clear, it allows for overcoming the potential temptation of falling into analytical categories which structure space into singular or binary terms (Lefebvre, 1991/1974: 39). Hence an understanding of refugee
camps as a specific space must take into considerations all three aspects of social space: “That the lived, conceived and perceived realms should be interconnected, so that the subject, the individual member of a given social group, may move from one to the other without any confusion – so much is a logical necessity” (Lefebvre, 1991/1974: 40).

Those using Lefebvre’s triad to appreciate the organization of space are mainly from the field of human geography and anthropology. For example, it has been used to design more comprehensive understanding of urban and architectural planning situations (Carp, 2008), comparing models for community planning based on rural and urban children’s perceptions (Machemer, Bruch & Kuipers, 2008), as a model for understanding governmental policies and urban development (Buser 2012), as a mean to understand the importance of spatial settings in procceses of organizational learning (Fahy, Easterby-Smith & Erland Lervik, 2014; Rowe, 2015), as a way of understanding and framing the role of desire and the search for lost, forgotten spaces regarding spatial planning (Petani & Mangis, 2016) or for understanding specific, iconographic spaces worldwide (Ng, Tang, Lee & Leung, 2010) or as “a fruitful heuristic through which organizational scholars can reflect upon ‘spatial situations’” (Beyes & Michels, 2011: 525).

These authors are doing what Lefebvre wanted, trying to use the triadic form for analysis, because the perceived-conceived-lived triad (in spatial terms: spatial practice, representations of space, representational spaces) looses all its force if it is treated as an abstract ‘model’. If fit cannot grasp the concrete, (as distinct from the ‘immediate’), then its import is severely limited, amounting to more than that of one ideological mediation amongst others” (Lefebvre, 1991/1974: 40). Yet there is I believe more to be found in Lefebvre’s ideas of space, notably the somewhat enigmatic notion of abstract space, which if approached though the conceptual triad of conceived, perceived and lived space, lends any analysis a politicized coherence that allows organizational forms such as the camp to be

---

33 Interestingly enough though, Lefebvre himself has not put the concept into practice or related it to the study of an actual phenomena or empirical case.
approached as a space of possibility as well as a space of reasons, as a space of transformative as well as disciplined life, as a space that is far from the real as much as it is real.

4.4 Abstract Space

“Only in a world in which the space of the states have been thus perforated and topologically deformed and in which the citizen has been able to recognize the refugee that he or she is – only in such a world is the political survival of humankind today thinkable.”

(Agamben, 2000: 26)

“Today, more than ever, a political action is defined through the type or form of State that it tends to realize. Such an action must thus be conceived more in terms of the potentialities that it cultivates than in terms of its analyses of the extant, which are often tainted by ideology and which always risk justifying a dogmatic position. In political thought and in political theory, the category (or concept) of the “real” should not be permitted to obscure that of the possible.”

(Lefebvre, 2001: 1979:769)

On the basis of our understanding of space as social product, the notion of the everyday and an outline of the spatial triad of conceived, perceived and lived spaces, we will delve further into a reading of Lefebvre and denote the following section to understand the concepts of Abstract Space a concept relevant for understanding the outcome and logics of the relationship between state and space and furthermore a central notion within Lefebvre’s writing and yet: whereas the aforementioned concepts and
notions have been used extensively in human geography, political or legal research, and less so in organization studies, the concept of abstract space remains weirdly underrepresented, "overlooking the significance of abstraction" (Wilson, 2013b: 365). Weirdly though, because it is crucial for Lefebvre himself, who, when seeking to describe a history of spaces - "the dialectic of spatial history" as Dimendberg coins it (1998: 22) - begins by unfolding the development from absolute to abstract space.

Absolute space was a space of mediation, of the translation of political and religious symbols onto natural sites: caves and trees, mountains and rivers. Whilst absolute spaces reside outside the city and places of inhabitants, they were nevertheless transferred and moved into the heart of those socio-political forces, which had occupied them (e.g. the Greek city state), but remained elusive, so hovering "between speech and writing, between the prescribed and the forbidden, between accessible and reserved spaces, and between full and empty" (1991/1974: 163) and indeed could actually contain nothing, yet were also filled with aspects and beliefs (think of the Greek Parthenon for example, Lefebvre 1991/1974: 237). Absolute Space continued to be "always bodily, spatially, and politically embedded in a material order, an imago mundi 'out there'' (Blum & Nast, 1995: 568).

Lefebvre denotes a political or religious character (while emphasizing the religious, hinting both at the primary reason for occupying natural spaces and transforming them into absolute ones, as well as to the role of religion as political force) to absolute spaces, and this character being performed and exercised through linguistic and bodily practices, meaning that absolute space, is "lived rather than then conceived", it is "representational space, rather than representation of space" (Lefebvre, 1991/1974: 234 – 252).

Absolute space therefore is universal to the groups and societies of its concern (and again: we find a mutual relationship, a dependency and oscillation between space and society), "an alleged internal unity between [a society's] artistic, religious and political forms" (Dimendberg, 1998: 22). Therefore, form and function, signifier and signified, meaning and action were inseparable. This unity was supplied through an originary logos that meant that meaning was lived in an immediate sense (Blum & Nast, 1995).
The force through which these absolute spaces lost meaning and then indeed their space, or were gradually transformed into visibility, the ability to be practiced, lived indeed, is history itself (or more precisely: the alienation of labour from it social contexts (Lefebvre, 191/2974: 49). Lefebvre detects the reasons for these changes in “history smashing naturalness forever and upon its ruins establishing the space of accumulation (the accumulation of all wealth and resources: knowledge, technology, money, precious objects, works of art and symbols)” (Lefebvre, 1991/1974: 48-49). The appearance of abstract space as the dominant spatial form we encounter nowadays, as we will discuss further below, is hence situated within a certain historical context, the revolutionary changes experienced by societies through the emergence and establishment of capitalism and the transformation of politics and economy in the mid and late 18th century (Dimendberg, 1998). Yet, the beginning of the change from absolute to abstract spaces may be situated within the 12th century, where beliefs and rituals are being challenged: “thought and philosophy coming to surface”, leading to a decryption of society as a whole and indeed of the spaces through which these societies achieved, practiced, exercised and produced unity, leading to the emergence (the production) of a new space, a space both social and mental, a space as practice and of organized perception, a secularized space, a space of accumulation, and a representational space (Lefebvre, 1991/1974: 262-263).

The production of new spaces allowed for new social-spatial practices, leading to a politicization of space: the formation of the nation state as the outcome of its own totalization, the occupation (indeed through violence and war) of space through sovereignty (and indeed often against church and the clerks), treating the state as “political society, dominating and transcending civil society, groups and classes” (Lefebvre 1991/1974: 279). In an Hegelian, Marxist reading of History, these processes, the submission of the city state, the feudal states and Merchant cities could only be achieved through violence, the building of a military apparatus and its ability to dominate, yet also responsible for the realization of technological, scientific and social possibilities. Space then becomes abstract space, “the negation of historical
and absolute space [...], a consequence of the industrial and political revolutions“ (Dimendberg, 1998: 23) a measurable unit, a politicised space and symbolized through its own codings.

Firstly, as measurable, abstract space has a geometric format - the space which can be calculated and defined. This further allows for a reduction of the three-dimensional idea of space to a two-dimensional coding, e.g. through plans and maps or texts. Secondly, abstract space is a space of visual rather than a multi-sensory format, following a strategy of the optical totalization of whole societies. Space is rendered to its visuality over all other senses (a text to bread), and all different perceptions of space, e.g. a rhythmic one, are made to point to their own transformation towards visuality. Space, Lefebvre notes, “has no existence independently of an intense, aggressive and repressive visualization” (Lefebvre 1991/1974: 286). And thirdly, the symbolization of violence and power (the “phallic format”), yet not remaining in abstraction purely, but being exercised through dominant symbols, through police, bureaucratic apparatus and the military, all of which enable space to become commodified (Lefebvre, 1991/1974: 285-286). Hence, “according to Lefebvre, the modern form of space is abstract space; a social space in which difference and distinction are continually eroded by the commodification of space” (Allen & Pryke, 1994: 457). And as Stewart concludes: “Abstract space is characterized by both the fragmentation and homogenization of space, and both processes are the result of the commodification of space. Homogeneity is promoted by the need for commodities to be exchangeable (and the contractual enforcement of this). Exchange demands comparability, interchangeability; hence the 'parcellization' of space into homogeneous blocs” (1995: 615). The notion of homogeneity plays a decisive role for understanding the politics of abstract space and, as we will later see, also for understanding the spatial politics through which refugee camps are being produced. Guy Debord may have coined the notion of the abstraction of space for the first time in the society of the spectacle in 1967:
“The capitalist production system has unified space, breaking down the boundaries between this society and the next. This unification is also a process, at once extensive and intensive, of trivialization. Just as the accumulation of commodities mass-produced for the abstract space of the market inevitably shattered all regional and legal barriers, as well those corporative restrictions that served in the Middle Age to preserve the quality of craft production, so too was it bound to dissipate the independence and quality of places. The power to homogeneize is the heavy artillery that has battered down all Chinese walls” (1994/1967: thesis 165).

The breaking down of the boundaries between this society and the next, the processes of unification, Lefebvre notes, is the essence of abstract space: its goal and perspective, its means and end, is homogeneity. The presence and form, maybe, to be more precise, the façade of abstract space, is homogeneous and it is so, recalling the visual format of abstract space, through its representations, “on the one hand as representations of space (geometric homogeneity) and on the other hand a representational space (the phallic homogeneity)” (Lefebvre, 1991/1974: 288).

Still, Lefebvre reminds us, whereas the orientation of abstract space is homogeneity, the space itself can never be homogeneous. Recalling the constant production of space as socio-spatial product, as well as an understanding of space as being constantly intertwined with and produced through the spatial triad of lived, perceived and conceived spaces, we are urged to go behind the curtain of the visual representations of abstract space: for it only seems as if there was no mystery, no hidden trajectories, no imminent paradoxes within the alleged transparency of the appearance of abstract spaces. Certainly, while abstractions of space seek to unify or produce unified images and imaginations of itself, society does not partake as a whole in the benefits provided and produced through such, there are beneficiaries and those who have no part in space. For Lefebvre the reason for such heterogeneity (injustice or exclusion to phrase it more politically and more precise) lies in the intrinsic violence of abstract spaces: space is a
strategic tool\textsuperscript{34} and its use is marked by the introduction of any action which introduces and transcends the rational into reality, an introduction often carried out through and via the occupation of symbols and signs (abstractions) over nature, a violent introduction originating out of the rational. (Lefebvre, 1991/1974: 289).\textsuperscript{35} Insofar as these tendencies are orchestrated, they are the result of a strategy hinting at a civic order and ordering elements (sign, symbols, language, legal and political frame), as much as they are product of institutionalized powers (the state and its executive) seeking to achieve a “repressive efficiency” (Butler, 2009: 324). The production of the state can only be achieved through the production of abstract space, or “the concrete abstraction of social space, the production of a homogeneous national territory” (Wilson, 2013b: 370).\textsuperscript{36}

The processes of abstraction, or, differently read, the notion alienation then play a central role in Lefebvre’s understanding of abstract space, through which social bounds and ties are being redistributed and altered, transferred into a realm of measurability, technocracy and the politics of planning, controlling and organizing, managed and exercised on the territory of and through the state\textsuperscript{37}. Abstract spaces then, again borrowing a Foucauldian term, may be seen as spaces of govermentality, or: a spatial understanding of govermentality, being marked through its “metaphorization, which, applied to the historical and cumulative sphere, transfers them into a sphere where violence is cloaked in rationality and a rationality of unification is used to justify violence (Lefebvre, 1991/1974: 282; Italics in original).

\textsuperscript{34} “A strategic space [...] seeks to impose itself on reality despite the fact that it is an abstraction” Lefebvre (1991/1974:94).
\textsuperscript{35} This homogeneity shows itself in modern architecture, where (at airports, streets, office buildings), unlike in the old cities, shaped by the creative force of nature “the sameness need not be underlined, and only details differ among the ugly buildings, functional edifices and even monuments. We enter into a world of combinations whose every element is known and recognized” (Lefebvre 2009/1980: 212-213).
\textsuperscript{36} Or, as Lefebvre puts it in his essay on “The urban revolution”: The state can “introduce its presence, control and surveillance in the most isolated corners [through an organization] according to rationality of the identical and repetitive” (2003/1970: 86).
\textsuperscript{37} Also through its institutions: hospitals, classrooms, universities, tax authorities, urban planners and so forth (Lefebvre 1991/1974: 280).
And still, abstract space, as any socio-spatial concept within the work of Lefebvre, is not a static concept or entity, it can never be homogeneous, even though homogeneity is its goal, the social production of the everyday, the lived experience always holds the possibility of resistance, of counter-narrating, of seeing differently. We have to keep both in mind: the history of the spaces, leading to the becoming of abstract spaces in which we are experiencing (and maybe even, as part of a state machinery, contributing to, in our own ways) processes of unification, the attempt to produce homogeneity amongst society, always being a violent attempt of organizing, and yet also the potential of the lived experience, the impossibility of homogeneity and our possibility to lift and look and finally to walk behind the curtain.
4.5. Spatializing the body and its politics

*Though seemingly secured against violence, abstract space is in fact inherently violent.*

(Lefebvre, 1991/1974:387)

“In a fundamental way, if there is social struggle, intellectuals and writers are useless, because: If your toilet is overflowing you don’t want Dostoyevsky to come to your house”

(Harlan Ellison quoted by Dietmar Dath, 2015)

“A [...] approach is called for today, an approach which would analyse not things in space, but space itself, with a view to uncovering the social relationships embedded in it.

(Lefebvre, 1991/1974: 89)

Interestingly enough, there is little or no mentioning of the space of the camp within the work of Lefebvre. His focus is the city and more widely the urban space. This may best be explained by his origins as a Marxist analyst of space, focussing on the city space as a space of production not only of space, but indeed goods and services, housing for workers, areas of relaxation and pleasure and so forth. It remains surprising though, that the camp remains unmentioned, maybe even avoided in his oeuvre. While he shows interest in the genesis of the roman military camp as a space representing the order of the cohort or the legion, a space instrumentalized for military purposes, we cannot find a thorough reflection of other kinds and forms of camps or even the military camp of the present. This is surprising as by the time of writing “The production of space” in 1974 the discussion of the national-socialistic concentration and extermination camps as a space of suppression and death had been well-established and sparked debates all over. Furthermore, the camp, may be the most notable space for the paradigmatic qualities it bears as a space of analyses, and seems to be of significant interest when analysing the contradiction and oscillations between
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“a place imaginary” (the idea of a space, an absolute space in the terminology of Lefebvre), a real, localized space (an abstract space in the terminology of Lefebvre, an institutional space of violence), and establishing the “the truth of a space” (Lefebvre, 1991: 251).

If we follow Agamben in his analysis, that the camp is the topological manifestation of the political, the “paradigm of political space” (2002a: 180), we have to think of Lefebvre’s analysis developed in his work on the Production of Space, hinting at a thinking of political processes as spatial processes and vice versa. This is not only of importance with regard to this investigation of refugee camps and the methods it uses, but even more so, since, from an analysis of space, we can and must include in this a thinking through of the political and that an investigation of the organisation and the underlying politics of refugee camps cannot be separated from the topological manifestations through which these come into being.

Space then is a term, which, unlike others, includes the spheres of juxta-positioning and co-existence (Massey, 1999: 28). Following the Agambian analysis of the camp, this is true in a double sense: as a juxtaposition of the within, and the co-existence (the necessity of it) with an outer space, a territory, from which the camp is separated, but inscribed (Agamben, 2006: 39). The first, in a Lefebvrian reading of space, can best be grasped though an understanding of space as a spatial triad, as a co-existing of different spatial (and therefore social and political) practices. The latter then as a certain form of abstract space, as a space of ideas, seeking to create and produce social homogeneity through bureaucratic politics.

This then is the first reason, why there is a both a necessity and a possibility of combining a thinking of the camp through an analysis of its paradigmatic qualities with an investigation on how spaces (and then: these spaces, the camps) come into being and with the claim, that they are equally a social product as do they produce the social. Understanding and engaging with these spaces and the figures it produces needs to include both discussions: the political is spatial and the spatial political.
In taking up an argument, which has been developed in depth and discussed in the previous chapter, Agamben refers to the state of exception as the opening space, through and in which the separation of a norm and its application are being presented - and which finds its permanent realisation in the space of the camp (Agamben, 2004: 51). What unfolds then is a link between the writings of Agamben and Lefebvre, a link which will allow for an analysis of refugee camps and the organization of refugees and their organising with an Agambian vocabulary and notions, but also through the necessary methodological and practical point of departure with the thinking of Lefebvre, who claims “against traditional philosophers”, that we must “rediscover the richness and meaning [of the world of sense]” (1968/1966: 5). The spatial manifestation of a separation of a norm and its application relates to the realm of conceived space: orders and hierarchies are implemented through certain spatial practices and it is only through those practices, so I argue, that one can understand the political and hence organizational effects which are embedded within. And also: allows for thinking the juxtaposition along, precisely because the space of the camp in its embedded use of architecture, signs and symbols as a mean for ordering cannot be homogeneous and ordered as such: “Abstract space is not homogeneous; it simply has homogeneity as its goal, its orientation, its lens. And, indeed, it renders homogeneous. But in itself it is multiform” (Lefebvre, 1991/1974: 287).

The space of the camp needs to be understood as a produced space, which has come into being through war and violence and as a space, which is being governed by political institutions and yet remains multiform in the sense of the spatial triad outlined above and as a social product, constantly changing and proceeding through the social realities which are inscribed in and produced through it. The camp then is a space of ideas, an ideal space, in the way that these ideals are inscribed into its being and enforced through the production of the space. It is abstract space (the space of bureaucratic politics) that produces, imposes and reinforces social homogeneity.
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Whereas Agamben is inviting us to observe and understand the space of the camp as ‘nomos’, Lefebvre urges us to know the everyday (of spatial practices, the city, the camp) for “to know the everyday is to want to transform it”. Returning to the opening quote of this section: now that we have engaged with the discussion of the problematic of the space (of the camp), both conceptually and theoretically, we will turn to the empirically observable and the practices of the everyday, to the everyday of two camps in Sub-Saharan Africa, Ghana and Nigeria, Buduburam and Oru.

5 Methodologies

[At the gate of a camp I]:

“Google Earth’s new mapping program takes you on a virtual reality tour with the UN refugee agency of some of the world’s major displacement crises and the humanitarian efforts aimed at helping the victims. The first use of this geospatial tool focuses on refugees and displaced people located in remote areas of Chad, Iraq, Colombia and Sudan’s volatile Darfur region. Sit in front of your computer and, with a few clicks, see, hear and develop an emotional understanding of what it is like to be a refugee. Highlighted are not only the physical area of the camp and surrounding country, but key parts of daily life such as education and health in photo, text and video format. Within seconds, Google Earth brings the daily life of a refugee camp into your home thousands of kilometres away.”


This short introduction to a “new” device offered collaboratively by the UNHCR and Google is linked to a program, which offers the user the possibility to develop an emotional understanding “of what it is like to be a refugee”. It promotes health and education as key parts of daily life within a refugee camp. And is raises awareness to major displacement crises around the world ranging from the Middle East (Iraq), to Southern America (Columbia) and Africa (Chad and Sudan). Apart from the fact that one shall
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obviously be able, just with a few clicks, to “see, hear and develop” an emotional understanding of what it is like to be refugee, what does this text tell us about refugee camps, its inhabitants and the possibilities of actually encountering those, who are thousands of kilometres away.

The device may be perceived as a way of encountering, a way of getting around linked to the promise of understanding and being part, not so different from a variety of travel blogs, books or tours offering to encounter an authentic place or authentic people, being truly part of what is alien to one, e.g. as a tourist.

Yet, it seems there is something more to this, than just a roadmap through which we may encounter the life of refugees. Following Lefebvre, the way we encounter defines the ontology of what is: refugees are victims, in need of being helped. Humanitarian efforts aim to do so. The everyday of the refugee is structured – occupied one might say – through the highlighting of what is most important, or being perceived as such. And then, there is more to that: can a virtual tour be a reality tour? What is helping, what does it consist of? Is it helping or does it rather offer an understanding to what the helpers perceive as helping? Who classified the victims as such? Who does this, apparently in this case constructed, social group consist of? And does this group share this description? Are there other ones, which may co-exist to the one? And if: Why aren’t they mentioned? What do humanitarian efforts consist of? Why is the Darfur region in Sudan mentioned as the only part of a country, with the other examples given, consisting of rather large and diverse nations as well? What is an emotional understanding? Which kind of feelings or actions shall such an understanding provokes or evoke? Is there a state to know what it is like to be a refugee? Can such an understanding be developed from thousands kilometres away? If there is, can it be developed only through a few clicks? And is there a common understanding of what it is like to be refugee for camp inhabitants themselves? Is it the same as the above-mentioned victim? How do you highlight a daily life? Are education and health part of the daily life? Are they
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part of a daily life in the world’s major displacement crises? Are they part of the mentioned humanitarian efforts?

Maybe the question here is much more: How is the social reality of the camp produced here? How is the emotional understanding of what it is like to be a refugee produced? And how is the claim, that we believe we can actually, be, feel, see like a refugee conveyed? And what does this mean politically?

In this light, the device offered by the UNHCR and Google we are presented with the formal possibility of being an emotionally sophisticate observer. A centre, an arbitrary one, but yet a centre, called the observer, the place from which one can start being only a few clicks away, a centre, which may be a random house or apartment or a school in Kentucky or Catalonia has the possibility of surveying and observing those places on the outside, hence linking the centre to the periphery, Delaware to Darfur. “The people at the periphery cannot tell whether they are being watched” Taussig (2012: 79) reminds us and obviously, this is the case if within seconds, the daily life of the periphery is brought into our homes at the centre thousands of kilometers away.

I had no use of such a centre, my observation took place from within, a centre of sorts.

[At the gate of a camp II]:

---

38 Which reminds us of Michel Foucault’s interpretation of the panopticon as theorised by Jeremy Bentham in the late 18th century: "This enclosed, segmented space, observed at every point, in which the individuals are inserted in a fixed place, in which the slightest movements are supervised, in which all events are recorded, in which an uninterrupted work of writing links the centre and periphery, in which power is exercised without division, according to a continuous hierarchical figure, in which each individual is constantly located, examined and distributed among the living beings, the sick and the dead - all this constitutes a compact model of the disciplinary mechanism" (1975/1995: 196).
And then, I stand in front of the gate at Buduburam refugee settlement.

I have passed by here a couple of days ago, on my way east, towards Accra and I haven’t really noticed the entrance, the gate, but I have seen the sign. It is large and about five meters above ground and it says: Buduburam police station, on white ground in blue, large letters, and a bit smaller below: Sponsored by the UNHCR. Behind the sign, there is a flat, but, compared to the surrounding huts large building, it seems new, comparably new, freshly built. Following the guidance of the sign, this must be, at least, the police station to the camp I am about to visit. The camp itself, nevertheless, remains hidden. It is not, because I have not attempted to find it. I have tried to locate the gate of the camp, I have actually been starring out of the window of the little, crowded VW-bus, I took that day. The reason I haven’t seen the gate – because it was invisible to me. At least on that day, sitting in a driving bus, hidden behind numerous little stands and shops and bars and motorcycles and busses and cars and people, a lot of people actually moving around, back and forth and sideways, as it seemed that day. So that was my first encounter with the refugee settlement I was about to visit after resting in Accra a few days and getting in contact with the camp management, actually getting back in contact with them and letting them know, that I was about to visit, stay and research at the place. This has been part of an e-mail conversation, going back and forth between Switzerland back at that time and Buduburam refugee settlement, a place 40 km west of Accra, in the West-African state of Ghana. I have contacted the camp management, writing about myself and more importantly about my research project, a project possible leading to a PhD degree at my university, a project, which seeks to reflect on refugee camps (in general, somewhat obvious), about the politics of such a place (a bit more specific, but possible a bit unclear both to the camp management and yes, probably at that time to me as well), hoping to get the permission to access the settlement, to move around, to have a close (whatever this then would be) look at it, to sit there, to walk there and maybe most importantly: to talk to people actually living there, refugees as I would have called them back then, camp inhabitants as I would call them now, still unsatisfied referring to a heterogeneous group of people and not
being able to acknowledging this heterogeneity and somewhat hiding both, my dissatisfaction and the heterogeneity, behind an inclusive term such as: camp inhabitants. I have let them know, by trying to explain and sending over curriculums and letters and background information, trying and hoping and knowing a bit from previous experiences and stays on the sometimes vast and always diverse African continent (at least some of its Sub-Saharan countries) that involving authorities is the way to get things done, not so much different from any other place probably, but with less possibilities of getting around these authorities, being police, state officials and, as I assumed, camp management. The camp management answered, and they answered positively: I was welcome to Buduburam, I was invited to meet them and to get in touch with them, they would show me around and grant me access to the camp, I could see schools and hospitals and talk to people, only I should get in contact with them before I was to arrive. This is what I was about to do in Accra, getting back on an Internet connection or calling them from my Ghanaian pre-paid cell phone card, which I had purchased since entering the country, after being back to Nigeria, meeting friends there and diving in the tremendous complexity and nervosas vibrations of Lagos. I have been sitting down at an Internet-coffee in Accra, writing a mail, that I was about to visit Buduburam in two days, three at the most, right after I found a place to stay, close to the camp, a motel somewhere on the Highway to Accra. The camp management replied immediately, stating that I was welcome (again), that they would even have a place for me on the camp ground (which I rejected – again: immediately, thanking for the offer though, but not wanting to be a) even more depended to the good will of an authority than necessary and b), quite honestly, being able to get out of there since I hardly knew what to expect, or to put it more neutral: to have space and time for my own - both subjects and matters, whose importance will be outlined in this text). I left Accra the following day, again taking a bus, this time westwards, towards the camp ground, stopping somewhere in the middle of the way, getting into a cab, being dropped off at what was to become my place for the following weeks. I settled and was about to visit Buduburam the following day. I was thinking about calling the camp management before visiting them (I had their phone number, it was sent to me in one of the last
e-mails I had received in Accra), but decided not to do so. To me, there was
no need to rush (I had time as I thought back then) and I thought it might be
a relaxed just to show up there, being there in person (and not just as an e-
mail address or as a voice on the phone), giving them the chance to meet me
and vice-versa. I left my place, got into a bus at the next intersection, getting
me out of the somewhat middle of nowhere, leaving me at the Highway,
crossing a four lane street, connecting the capital of Accra with other major
Ghanaian cities - and villages- along the coast line of the Atlantic, getting on
a bus, leaving it at the place which I had recognized to be my point of
(scientific) departure and beginning. It was called something else, it wasn’t
Buduburam for sure and it took me a couple of rides on similar busses to
understand, what the co-driver, a young boy most of the time, who was
collecting the money for the ride and squeezed people in, making sure, that
the bus was possibly filled to the outmost extent, was actually yelling:
Liberian camp. To me, it was just this police sign again, which I recognized
and which made me get up and move my way through the bus towards the
driver, letting him know, that I wanted to be dropped off right there. I left the
bus, standing right into what I had noticed on my way towards Accra a few
day before: A market place, people moving around, yelling and screaming as
on any other market, with the merchants trying to sell their goods. Maybe
fifty meters from where I was standing, I finally recognized a gate, an actual
gate and a building to my right, covered with the signs and symbols of the
UNCHR, with a couple of benches in front of it, all of them empty, under a
tent-like structures, providing some shade from the sun, again being covered
with the blue signs of the United Nations High commission for Refugees.
And as I approached the gate, I saw a metal sign, a bit shady and messed up,
pointing towards a smaller building to my left, stating: Camp Management.
The building it was pointing towards had an L-shape, turned 180 degrees,
with a tree in front of it and, underneath this trees spreading shade, a white
SUV. I entered the small building, friendly smiling at the people around the
door – three men, either sitting on chairs out in front of the entrance on the
small terrace or leaning on the little wall, which was surrounding the door.
The room I walked in was small, maybe 20 qm2, with a little bench left to the
doors, a desk right in front of me, filled with piles of paper and a computer
screen, a generator was running, producing a monochrome sound, present in the background.

This is a text I wrote during my field work, a vignette of my first encounter (or actually just before my first encounter) with Buduburam Refugee Settlement, a reflection of my journey and my arrival, an arrival which is still at the outside of the camp, before and not behind the gate, but still a centre of sorts, as it was from within me. I am not sure whether this vignette gives an impression of what it is like to be a refugee, but I am sure that was not the intention of writing it. I am not even sure, whether it gives a good impression of being the researcher at the gate of the camp or whether this vignette allows for an impression of the surrounding of the gate or a journey and its means (the flight, the bus, the cab, the motel), but I am sure it displays a different kind of methodology, in contrast to the aforementioned 'new' UNHCR – Google mapping device. The impossibility of being invisible here, the feeling of sweat on the skin and the heat, the feeling of being exposed at an actual outside, the entering of a certain street and path, the smells and sights of people, signs, borders stand in sharp contrast to the distancing possibilities inherent in an app; it is a displaying of myself. I will try to elaborate on the necessity of this exposing and hence on the methodological differences between a part-taking and part-making on the one hand, and remaining spatially on the outside on the other; part of the difference in methods, is informed and shaped, actually determined by the theoretical frame chosen and outlined before.

The following chapter hence links the theoretical discussion of the previous chapters to the methodological considerations, which have guided and framed the fieldwork and analysis. In doing so, the chapter discusses the politics of the use of a specific set of methods and the researcher’s role in collecting, presenting and constructing data. It then discusses the politics of researching refugee camps in particular and hence deepens the understanding of the particularity of researching a contested and often closed field and space, yet, while doing so, hinting at the underlying intimacy between theorizing a space and researching it. Finally, the chapter introduces
the methods and the fieldwork, which builds the basis for the analysis of the politics of organizing refugee camps.

5.1 Theorizing Methodology: The Politics of Researching Refugee Camps

“They say science has two phases: the imaginative logic of discovery, followed by the harsh discipline of proof. Yet proof is elusive when it comes to human affairs; a social nexus is not a laboratory, laws of cause and effect are trivial when it comes to the soul, and the meaning of events and actions is to be found elsewhere, as in the mix of emotion and reasoning that took the anthropologist on her or his travels in the first place.”

(Taussig, 2011: xi)

The social reality of the camps is not the same as its planning or the reality being proclaimed. Wolfgang Sofsky writes of what has been the most absolute institutional forming of a camp: the national-socialist concentration and extermination camp (2008: 23). And writing about camps on the basis of field work implies indeed, that “we are constantly constructing meaning and social realities” (Cunliffe, 2003: 985). If, with Sofsky, we understand the camp as a performed reality, re-enacted on a daily basis, embodied and changed through daily processes, coming into being as multiple worlds at once, we can then follow John Law’s argument, that “methods [no longer] discover and depict realities. Instead, it is that they participate in the enactment of those realities. It is also that method is not just a more or less complex set of procedures or rules, but rather a bundled hinterland” (2004: 45). Just as much as the Google GPS virtual reality tour is constructing a reality of refugees and refugee camps, so does the methodological frame of this thesis. Methods then are not just a purely technical set of procedures, through which a seemingly given reality is observed, analysed and written, but of highly aesthetic, ethical and political nature, precisely because a given set of methods changes, alters and prescribes the reality it so seemingly depicts. This is both a theoretical and empirical construction.
Gadamer reminds us of the original connotation and meaning of theory, originating from the Greek *theoros*; it is a part taking, since only he, who has been part-taking at something, knows about it and can give witness to it. Giving witness, being witness, observing, seeing – this stands at the core of this part-taking, of such an understanding of theory (1990: 129). By being witness, by being *theoros*, one gains a sacred invulnerability; this describes not a doing, but rather an experiencing, an ability to be hurt and suffer alongside someone else, an act of spectating, oblivious to everything else as Christoph Menke puts it (2013: 121). But whereas the sacred invulnerability in Gadamer’s reading of *theoros* is situated within an ordering which is happening through bearing witness, as an understanding of the gods’ will (and hence order), Menke hints at another understanding which is provided through the hermeneutics of *theoros*. Here theory is not another witnessing, but a displaced witnessing, a witnessing brought to another place, hence a witnessing and a transgression of this witnessing, a ‘passive’ part taking an ‘active’ bringing to. Theory then is not a fixed result, but a process of becoming through and with the (aesthetic) spectator as Menke puts it (2013: 123). The theorist then is a traveller. The essential part of doing theory is the journey to an outside: the theorist is a spectator, remaining on the outside and listening and watching there. Yet the theorist is also a messenger, who is then returning home to tell and report of what has been witnessed. Theory then is not a different kind of spectating, but a spectating brought to a different place: doing theory is a rupture of the witnessing and suffering along with what has been experienced. It is marking the difference between an aesthetic experience and the report on that experience; but by doing so, it returns to the experience and becomes likewise the memory of the aesthetic experience, which it is leaving behind (Menke, 2013: 126). If theory then is understood as a process between witnessing and claiming, it is a process with dual directions: It is, on the one hand, the process from witnessing to reporting, the movement from the passive part-taking to an active self-determination. On the other hand, theory is the process from reporting to witnessing, the memory of the aesthetic part taking in the momentum of writing about it. Menke, again, refers to this duality as
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thinking. The theorist thinks. Thinking is the re-imagination of being moved in the field as spectator, as well as it is the self-actualization through giving witness.

Empirically, very obviously, it is a being there, noting down, but not noting down as such, for writing, as Taussig (2011: 18) notices, often removes you from the field:

"Ingeniously distinguishing what he calls “headnotes” and “scratch notes” from “fieldnotes,” the anthropologist Simon Ottenberg believes that the headnotes—what you do not write down but keep inside your head—are “always more important than the fieldnotes.” In his case the fieldnotes seem obsessively methodical and were typed up for careful perusal by his rather nosey professors back in Evanston, Illinois, a long way from Nigeria, where he began fieldwork in 1952. Looking back thirty years later at his three types of notes, it seems to him that the closer they were to writing, the less valuable and interesting they were. The more he actually wrote, we might conclude, the less he got. The writing machine was actually an erasing machine."

Yet still it is a being there and belonging to the performance and in such contributing to the stories that I will then recall in writing notes and then thinking these through in presentations, most notably, the presentation of this thesis. It matters to do this, to witness and try and then make claims about refugee camps. Ethically and methodologically, these are difficult places to research (Sieber, 2009), yet it matters, especially when doing it spatially. As Soja (2009: 1) notes:

"Thinking spatially about justice not only enriches our theoretical understanding, it can uncover significant new insights that extend our practical knowledge into more effective actions to achieve greater justice and democracy. Obversely, by not making the spatial explicit and assertive, these opportunities will not be so evident."
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The study at hand is based empirically on a three month research stay in and around two refugee camps in Sub-Saharan Africa, one in Ghana, Buduburam Refugee Settlement and one in Nigeria, Oru Refugee camp, with a focus on the first one. Michel Agier (2011: 180) points out a reading of camps of refugees or displaced persons that has them as:

“out places, [that] are initially constituted as outsides, placed on the edges or limits of the normal order of things – a ‘normal’ order that ultimately remains still today a national one. They are characterized a priori by confinement and a certain extraterritoriality.”

For a theorist (the theorist leaving one space for another, experiencing aesthetically, and returning to give witness), the notion of extraterritoriality is of decisive importance when reflecting upon the politics of researching refugee camps. They are indeed places outside, a nomos in the double meaning of the word, as space and as law. What accounts here for refugees, mirrors itself for the researcher visiting the sites, there is an inside that is also an outside, and getting in, literally and conceptually, is difficult, as the camp exists as a properly ordered, heavily edged, space, and also as a counter to the proper space of the nation in which space the camp exists, almost as another space.39 To get into the camps requires admission and a certain almost official style, things that have to be struggled for.

Research concerning refugees and people affected by forced migration is most often set in circumstances, which are politically challenging, involving traumatized and vulnerable people, difficult and also potentially dangerous, both for the researcher and the refugees concerned by this research or in contact with the researcher, as Mackenzie, McDowell &

39 Agier uses Michel Foucault’s term of heterotopias to describe camps. Heterotopias are counter-sites, and include for example cemeteries, prisons, sauna, museums, theatres or festivals to just name a few of the example Foucault gives39 to illustrate the concept or specific aspects of it. One of these aspects, or principles, inherent to the logic of heterotopias, are that they “presuppose a system of opening and closing” (Foucault, 1967/1984: 7) and then: “to get in, one must have a certain permission and make a certain gesture”. And indeed, Agier’s reading of refugee camps as heterotopian spaces holds true, potentially as a reading of the site as what it means to the society creating it.
Pittaway point out (2007: 299). Refugee camps in particular are embedded in this field and yet have a set of specific characteristics, which influence the ethics, politics and methods of research, compared to, for example, research on refugees in private housing or urban areas as Inhetveen reminds us (2010): On the one hand, refugees in camps can be located well – at least in theory, whereas many of the camps are not only places outside, but also indeed places hidden; they are indeed through their encampment a group of people, which are tied tight to a definite location but that is hard to locate. This, them, at first sight, makes it more difficult for them to escape interview situations and observations for they are very fixed and official. Yet on the other hand, as we are being reminded when thinking refugee camps spatially, with borders and restrictions, one cannot simply enter a refugee camp. Going back to Lefebvre’s sense of space in the previous chapter, the camp is accessible space for normal use, which here is abnormal for those displaced, and, one presumes, normal for those professionals responsible for organising the camp as a place of abode. The rules and procedures are set down and enforced by borders, defining a territory in a territory to which access is prohibited both relatively and absolutely and which I have to find a way of crossing an occasion (junction point) for occupying a while.

Permissions need to be granted and the access to the field is restricted. Furthermore, within camps, we find a variety of different actors and groups with different (often divergent and conflicting) interest and backgrounds, such as NGO’s, International Organizations, Refugee Organizations, doctors, teachers, priests, witches, national camp management and so forth. These actors play an important role in the research process as sources of inspiration and information, but also as with regard to potentially influencing and shaping the research agenda. Bradley has argued that the role of, for example NGO’s or International Organizations as well as National Camp Management, does not only lay within the possibility of granted access, but also within their power to determine who is being talked to, about what, where and when (2017: 119).

Whereas Bloch argues that “Research with refugees takes place within several social science disciplines and is increasingly inter-disciplinary in
nature. The methods and methodologies employed by different social science disciplines have differed historically and range from large-scale surveys to ethnographic studies” (2007: 230).

Within this broad scope of methods and potentialities of engaging with refugees and refugee studies, Roger has argued for indeed “hanging out with forced Migrants”, stating that “continued relevance and importance of small-scale qualitative approaches, generated largely through intensive, informal and interpersonal interactions between researchers and the forced migrants” will rather, than a quantitative methodology which seeks to bring some sort of order into the disordered world of forced migration, reflect the complexity and chaos of everyday life amongst refugees or Internally Displaced People (2004: 48-49). Engaging into the chaotic and everyday messiness of refugees is a time consuming endeavour: it is essential to take the time to explain, discuss and agree on interviewing and hanging out, being there. All requests from the researcher have to be agreed on and by refugees or potential interview partners. Furthermore, “it could be argued that if researchers are in a position to assist refugees to advocate on their own behalf or on behalf of others who have been subjected to these kinds of abuses, then it is morally incumbent on them to do so” (Mackenzie, McDowell & Pittaway: 2007: 318).

Furthermore, there are (as everywhere else) obvious differences between the researcher and the field, ranging from the background and experiences of all involved actors to problems due to translation issues and cultural differences, but research on refugees and forced migration is situated in an area (and space), where the presence of the researcher has a strong effect on the findings and the shaping of the field (Schmidt, 2007: 82). For example, talking to and being with refugees puts them potentially at risk: “Many researchers do not adequately consider how their inquiries put our subjects at risk, particularly in conflict zones or hosting areas where the displaced are highly vulnerable” as Jacobsen and Landau remind us (2003a: 10). Ethical dilemmas occur when researching sites where refugees are located: They range from the questions of confidentiality, for example in
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Interview situations and questions of security (certain areas of a camp may not to be entered or entered alone, other areas should not be visited after it is getting dark). Another ethical problem arises, when we return to the vignette from the beginning of the chapter: The possibilities for me as a researcher to live differently (to choose a place outside the camp to stay), to return to an airport and to leave the site, which has been researched and to return to it only in the form of this written text, marks a socio-economic difference between the researcher and the researched and has been re-appearing subject in conversations with refugees. For example, I have been asked several times, whether it would not be possible for me to take a respective interview partner along with me, back to Europe. In order to avoid situations like this, trust building amongst between the researcher and the field of study and its actors is essential and the work needs to be built up gradually as Kabranian-Melkion describes (2015: 717).

Furthermore, the motivation and motives of the researcher in fields such as crises areas needs to be examined and reflected about, partly as a self-reflective measure, partly through discussion with colleagues and friends (Sommers-Flanagan, 2007). In my case, being a male, caucasian Middle European (German) does shape the research, as well as the possibilities of engaging with the field of study (for example having access to certain areas and neighbourhoods, which would have been forbidden by the Camp Management for females to research or visit alone, but also being denied access to areas, which would have been open for a researcher with another gender, different language skills or national background).

Against the background of such considerations, Cunliffe and Karunanayake have hinted at an understanding of the relationships, which occur during and through ethnographic organizational research as “emergent and multiple [...] and agentic in the sense that researchers and respondents shape each others’ identities and actions” (2013: 365). So, just as much as the impossibility of visiting certain areas and the dependencies on the rhythm of daily activities that have shaped my understanding of camps (or parts of it), my presence has also resulted in adaptations or
attempts to make use of my presence by camp inhabitants. This, for example, could have been reached by making use of either being seen (or not being seen) together with me as the researcher, hinting at certain specific issues during interviews and shifting the focus to (or away) from certain areas during joint walks or observations during the camp visits. This entails, then indeed, a variety of ethical considerations: the power relationship between researcher and respondents (camp inhabitants) is often asymmetrical and by way of reproducing voices and observations, the researcher is constructing and shaping the identities of those, he or she has been in contact with during ethnographic field work, “treating them as generalized abstractions” (Cunliffe & Karunanayake, 2013: 365). In so-called hyphen-spaces, to be understood as spaces of possibilities between researchers and respondents, tensions as well as connections, which appear and are constructed during field work are outlined: hyphen-spaces of insider-ness and outsider-ness (is the researcher part or familiar to the organization, which is being studied; is the researcher perceived as a member of the community under investigation, etc.), of sameness and difference (is the researcher similar to respondents as with regard to for example gender, cultural and socio-economic background, values and so forth), of engagement and distance (to which extent is the researcher emotionally involved; what is the role of the respondents in knowledge generation; are participatory observations part of the research process, etc.) and of political activism and active neutrality (are the agendas of the researcher and the respondents partly aligned; does the researcher play an active role in the social or political struggles of respondents; etc.), play an important role as with regard to methodological considerations and research design and also regarding the multiplicities of identities we encounter as researchers when engaging with the field and its actors (Cunliffe & Karunanayake, 2013: 371ff.). These hyphen-spaces, even though offering different angles of analyses, are interlinked. I have been, for example, engaged in daily activities in the field (meetings, school visits, participation at recording sessions and café and bar visits, classes, etc.), but remained outside the camps overnight and hence could not fully account for activities after sun-set. The agendas of the researcher and the respondents then have
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undergone shifts and changes, due to the engagement with the field: I have become, for example, more aware of the unfolding of politics and managerial force on and through everyday routines and activities through interviews and observations and have therefore gained a deeper understanding of (and sympathy for) the concerns and issues of camp inhabitants in daily struggles.

These concerns are therefore indeed not only of methodological nature, but indeed of ethical and political importance. In the following section, I will outline my methodological concerns and use of methods, as well as some of the ethical and political concerns, which have shaped and influenced my research.
5.2 Collecting empirical Material

What is here fascinating is the role of the notebook that the author invokes with such frequency that it becomes a character in its own right—having a “role,” after all—anchoring the outlandish and strange with pen and paper. But immediately two possibilities, two questions, arise. Is the notebook actually playing this role as a quasi-character as the anthropologist navigates her way through Tiv [a Nigerian tribe] worlds? Or does the notebook assume this status afterward, when she is concocting her “fiction,” in other words a device that a writer (as in writer-of-fiction) uses to get the story to come alive? Either way the notebook is magical (Taussig, 2011: 27).

In his book “I swear I saw this”, the anthropologist Michael Taussig hints at a difference between ‘making’ and ‘taking’ when conducting field work; whereas making would for him be, also in light of his book which reflects on his sketches from fieldwork, indeed the drawing within the text of the notebook, surrounded, contradicted or supported by text and notes, the taking for him presents photography, indeed a taking out of the field.

The empirical material, which is presented throughout this thesis and builds a basis for its arguments, has been collected throughout a three month research period in Ghana and Nigeria in late 2011. Both refugee camps have mainly been erected for refugees fleeing the West-African civil wars in Liberia and Ivory Coast in the mid and late 1990’s and the early 2000’s. Refugees therefore are mainly from these two countries, but camp inhabitants are also from different countries of origin such as Central African Republic, Sudan or Eritrea. The camps are located off the respective capital or largest city of the countries: Oru lies northeast of Nigeria’s largest city Lagos, Buduburam is located west of Ghana’s capital Accra:
The material and the collection of the data at hand bears witness, that it does not represent the field as it is, but rather – and in line with the previous reflections on the politics of researching refugee camps and the role of the researcher in such processes – has shaped, informed, influenced and manufactured the site under study, in small and open ways (Law, 2004; Czarniawska, 2014: 26). Being aware of such processes, the study allowed me to be reflective about my own engagement in a highly politicized field, but also to intensify my engagement with it and account for the validity of the data. I have used a variety of methods to gather material, each with their distinctive advantages and disadvantages. In the following, I will give an overview of the data collected and the multiple forms of qualitative methods, through which I have engaged with the field:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Method</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Example(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interviews</td>
<td>Semi structured and open ended interviews; problem centred interviews</td>
<td>Interviews with Camp Management on daily routines, practices and hierarchies; interviews with refugees about the (his)story of fleeing and arrival; interview with refugee about occupation of camp structures and</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnographic photos</th>
<th>Photos of practices and spaces, offices and buildings, schools, hospitals, private spaces, houses, streets, squares, documents, signs, symbols etc.</th>
<th>Photo documentation of the surrounding of the camp(s), differences between the inside and the outside, which manifest themselves aesthetically; capturing spatial and atmospheres between and around gates, fences, waiting areas, shops, etc.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ethnographic observations</td>
<td>Participation in meetings and spending days of offices, following people through their days, reflections on interview situations</td>
<td>Joining meetings between camp management and elderly council; joining meetings of refugees discussing the prospects and possibilities of repatriation; participating at woman empowerment school classes and following the talks between the pupils, teachers and head of schools</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

During my research stay and time in Sub-Saharan Africa, I have collected over 50 interviews within the area of the refugee camps visited. These included camp management members and doctors, teachers and members of Non-Governmental Organizations, members of International Organizations, members of the Police and of the refugee organized organisations, such as the neighbourhood watch group or women schools, as well as refugees themselves. The interviews have been constructed as open-ended and semi-structured interviews, with a problem focus on issues and spaces (for example everyday practices, routines, relationship to other and between actors, the role of the space of the camp, inscription of identities through organizing them, questions of political engagement and activism). Questions concerning the background of the actors (especially refugees) have been treated with care and only included on the basis of a common agreement between the interview partners, due to the often traumatic
experiences which have brought refugees (primarily from Liberia and Sierra Leone to the camps in Ghana and Nigeria).

One of the difficulties in engaging in interview situations (and generally when researching forced migration), indeed, were matters of trust and confidentiality. Whereas it has been possible to record all interviews with members from NGO’s and camp management, interviews with refugees had to be based on notes and writing along while the interview was taking places – often resulting in pages of short comments and remarks, paragraphs and single quotes, which were then reflected on and supplemented. Also, the interview situations and the spaces within which these were taking place differed significantly: While interviews with members of organizations did take place in office spaces, interviews with refugees took place either in their homes, or outside, sitting for example under a tree, at a football field, next to a school or at a market square. The length of the interviews have been in between 30 minutes and two hours. As with regard to all interviews conducted, it has been important to establish a friendly and welcoming atmosphere, allowing for question from both sides, the rejection of certain topics and the possibility to explain certain questions or their intention (Spradley, 1979).

In order to prepare for the interviews, I drew on notes and mind maps, in which I sketched the field and my interest in the politics through which camps as spatial sites are informed and formed, produced and producing, as well as specific topics, I wanted to discuss and elaborate on with the respective interview partner. These notes helped me to structure the interview and allow for a thematic frame while carrying it out. Besides this, the structure helped to come back to certain topics, which had not been mentioned yet in an interview situation (also for me to express my wondering, why it has not been mentioned, if for example it has been a pressing topic amongst and for other interviewees), but also to review the interview in the moments, they were coming to an end. While this account of a semi-structured interview allowed for the aforementioned thematic theme and centred around central questions of this work at hand and the theoretical
texts which have informed it, I remained open to new topics and issues (to put it spatially: roads and spaces) within the interview situation, which often lead me to discover and engage with new, actual spaces and other interview partners.

The interview situations with refugees have been often evolving through a snowball system - the problem of apparent or attributional homogeneity amongst the interviewees (similar ages, similar concerns, similar backgrounds) has been wrestled with through a variety of starting points, ranging from self-organized refugee groups, to NGO supported refugee organizations, to families and friends. Whereas it has been problematic, that the access to the field (to the specific camps) had to be arranged through a gatekeeper and hence I would be associated with camp management (people seeing me entering and leaving the office for example, the first days in the field with guidance and guardian through a selected camp inhabitant).

I have tried to overcome a potential mistrust by staying in the field for a long time and by not being by the side of camp management of NGO members during official meetings and by returning to and (re)-visiting the spaces of the camp by myself. On the basis of an earlier study on the organization of the Temporary Holding Centre in Lampedusa, Italy and the European Migration Policies, I reflected on the interviews, interview situations and notes I had carried out or collected previously. In the beginning of each interview, I would introduce myself and the topic and its usage and clarify potential questions and discuss concerns: For example, I would have to state often in interview with refugees, that the interview itself would not be beneficial for the interview partner and that me, as the male Caucasian researcher I am and have described before, could not improve a specific or general situation, may it be through bringing forth a concern to the camp management or NGO or International Organization members, or by personally being able to ease asylum procedures or help with a transfer to Europe or the United States (both areas have been named most of the time as potential destination countries from refugees). There have been very few
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situations, in which I invited an interview partner for a coffee or offered a cigarette, but apart from that interviews have not been conducted on the basis of exchange of material or financial goods. In the following, I give an overview, about the interviews, which I have conducted during the period of my fieldwork; I have structured them roughly around organizational belonging and situated them within the contexts of the camps:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interviewee (Group or Organization)</th>
<th>Number of Interviews</th>
<th>Content Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Camp Management [CM]</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Relationship between CM and international donors;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO/ International Organizations</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Daily routines and sponsoring practices, upholding of infrastructure, e.g. water distribution and medical care, relationship to refugees and daily problems and challenges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refugees (Camp Inhabitants); Neighborhood Watch Group [NWG]</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Relationship between the camp inhabitants and citizens, challenges and dangers at work, relationship and dependencies between NWG and CM, status of NWG members within the camp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refugees (Camp Inhabitants); Woman Empowerment Schools [WES]</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Daily routines and practices, prospects and reflections on the courses and the concept of the WES’s; relationship and dependencies between and to NGO’s and CM, histories of fleeing and arriving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refugees (Camp Inhabitants); Shop Owners</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Taxation issues, histories of shops and owners, relationship between shops social status and relationship</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Another method to collect field material has been ethnographic observations, including observation of interview sites and spaces, describing dynamics between different actors and organizations, witnessing activities and spatial usage. These resulted in a variety of notes, references, reflections and sketches of mostly spatial practices and also included reflections on the atmospheres enacted and the feelings the observed situations evoked in me. These notes were hence ranging from detailed descriptions of actors and participants at meetings or events, the topics under discussion and reflections on the way these topics were discussed, to more general accounts of time and space, e.g. when reflecting about hanging out at a certain space (a school, a home, a square, a hospital, a gate) and hence including reflections and notes on a part-taking, about who was doing what and when, with whom and how, but also who was absent and did not make use of a space at a certain time. While walking and wondering through camps, note taking has been difficult, often I would rest and write down observations or encounters, I could not write before, or add comments, notes, ideas or theoretical input to what I have observed. All this evolved into what Taussig at the beginning of this chapter has called the "magical" notebook, hundreds of pages full of observations, questions, reflections; especially full also with notes on smells and sounds, sights and encounters, often of a type, which were difficult to catch or to grasp with other ethnographic methods.
Yet another way – hence following Yanow´s urge "to resist the equation of ethnography with interviewing" (2009: 195) - of collecting material has indeed been the use of ethnographic photography. Since taking pictures in refugee camps is potentially dangerous and challenging, all persons who could clearly be identified on a photo were asked beforehand whether a photo could be taken. The same was true for certain and specific situations, for example taking photos of private homes, meetings, document, etc. Taking pictures of sign and documents has been helpful in capturing material, which could not have been captured elsewise, due to a lack of, for example, copy machines. Pictures furthermore included photos of offices and materials, workshops and schools, hospitals and a variety of architectural and material realization of spaces, streets, walls, gates, houses, squares, fences, signs, etc. These practices, resulting in more than 200 photos of refugee camp specific encounters serve on the one hand as a mean to reflect and document on spatial settings and details embedded within their production, on the other hand help capturing certain atmospheres and the possibilities and limitations of research. Photographs, or the practice of taking pictures to be more precise, indeed involves the possibility and danger, of the object of the photo being aware of the fact, that in this and that moment a photo is being taken: Certain, distinctive ways of posing are created, the object in front of the lens is (or is consciously not) turning towards the camera or moves itself in a certain angle (Barthes, 1980/2000: 15f.).

Now this poses a danger, apart from the fact, that certain spatial objects (door bells, and streets, water pipes and electricity lines, toilets and fences, and so forth) cannot move themselves, but can only be moved by the photographer (maybe to produce them in a certain angle, in a certain light, in a certain contextualisation). Working on space includes recognizing two perspectives of exploration: “On the one hand, space is a concrete or material site, an object experienced, perceived and appropriated in everyday life. On the other hand, conceptions of space [...] need to be investigated in their respective historical and discursive contexts. (Widmer & Tamayo: 2005: 118). Photos then allow for example for comparison and finding
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(spatial) patterns and through this meaning, through exploring what is "what is unique and what is shared in each" (Collier: 1986/1999: 197). Such way of methodological thinking of capturing space, both in its socio-material as well as in its conceptual dimension does not only relate and mirror the overall ambition of this thesis when thinking the politics of refugee camps, but is also embedded in the theoretical thinking guided by both Agamben and Lefebvre outlined above. It is in this sense, and also when we return to the notion of the aesthetic spectator Menke has introduced us to, images and photos serve as the potential "capacity to respond to the contingent event of thinking though the elaboration of forms and practices of novel (if not necessarily revolutionary) togetherness” (Latham & McCormack, 2009: 261).

Images and photos are therefore not only a way of capturing, framing and telling my creation of the aesthetic experience, but are also inviting us as a way to think differently with and through them, for they "shape and contest the meaning of [...] space” (Latham & McCormack: 2009: 252) and therefore go beyond mere forms of representations in their meaning and form. Indeed, images help us to take time in figuring out, what they signify and therefore exceed potentially the pure form of representation and hence allow and help us to think spaces. And they are a form of engagement of the researcher with the spaces and practices he encounters, therefore both an aesthetic as well as an ethic endeavour, when trying to think the "multi-sensory nature of experiences” (Latham & McCormack, 2009: 261). Such multi-sensory nature needs to be expressed in the possibilities of thinking space through photos beyond the mere presentations of space, but using them to convey and narrate therefore hint at both the hinterland of engaging into a field of research as well as seeing also what cannot be seen on a picture, what has been left out, or why a certain frame had to be chosen, how the pictures are being organized and presented, chosen in dependency to, for example, personal, theoretical or academic backgrounds (Pink, 2007: 129). These pictures are hence themselves “operations of power” (Butler, 2010: 1). It has therefore been the intention, both while taking the photos and also now, in displaying them, to counter- or re-narrate the "frames deployed by dominant media sources” (Butler, 2010: 9), by attempting to use non-representational photos, pictures which rather show the hidden,
overlooked, than the obvious, which catches the eye of both the photographer and the viewer at first glance. They therefore link in a variety of ways as Latham and McCormack (2009: 253) remark, both the inner image (an idea, a way of carrying oneself, a memory) and the outer image (the photo, the image itself). These links then potentially do not silence a gap or rupture between the two, but opens it up for discussion and reflections, both of methodological as well as theoretical nature: For example, we might ask as with regard to a certain image, why it has been shot this way, why it has been chosen to be included in a text, why and whether its use is potentially metaphorical or representational, which affective intensity it bears and so forth. And we can turn in the same image to its content, what does it show, and what does it not show, what is included and what is excluded, why has this momentum of a practice or an action been captured? In this sense, images go beyond a mere representation of a momentum, but are embedded in its context, which is thought along through its exclusion of the block in space-time the image presents, they therefore also tell and show more about a certain space than just the buildings, streets, walls, people and faces:

Imagery is hence important to helping convey the sense of space of which Lefebvre speaks, its feels and sense of having been lived in. It is looser in framing, and so provokes the possibility of different interpretations, something which in her study of visual ethnography Pink (2001: 51-52) warns is both enriching and potentially confusing, the imagery can mean different things, and in an echo of Roland Barthes, carries with it discursive layers of symbolic value.

Care must also be shown in using images, what Harun Farocki (2004) notices is their innate political capacity to manipulate and how, in using them, one has to show care for those implicated. So, for example, when using aerial photographs of the Nazi concentration camps at the end of WWII where the victims spread out on the ground were little more than a dot, Farocki (2004: 22) recalls writing on the stills: "In the grain of the photograph lies the respect and the protection of the personality", warning us not to make too casual a use of images of suffering. Judith Butler has
argued in this regard, that one of the problems of viewing photos from zones of war (or refugee camps for that matter), is that “the presumptive viewer is outside the frame, over here, in a first-world context, and those who are depicted remain nameless and unknown” (2010: 93). This is again, why none of the methods can stand alone, but need to be read and presented in the context of one another: Not to silence the standing outside the frame, while looking at it, but to unfold on it and to present this rupture.

Therefore, all methods, which have been introduced by now, cannot be understood as singular existing next to each other, but have informed and shaped both the research process as well as the possibilities of analyses. For example, certain photos or moments which caught my eye, could have informed and shaped an interview, whereas my notes on certain situations and practices, but a lack of photo- or interview documentation on the same matter, informs about the limitations and politics of carrying out research on forced migration. In their difference as with regard to what they can capture, produce or make hear-, feel-, or visible, they account for the aesthetic experience of the traveling theorist who is witnessing and returning, but always mediated by these devices. Also, Yanow (2009: 194) has emphasized, that organizational ethnographies should and indeed go beyond the mere use of one method and are, in themselves, embedded in a variety of methods, pre-understandings and readings, which have shaped the understanding of the field a priori and the possibilities of accessing and encountering it.

The material has been organized and analysed through the notion of spatial narratives, which means a collection and (re)construction of the material around an understanding of refugee camps as socially produced and producing and around the terminology presented in previous chapters. For example, one might use stories, drawings, sketches, field notes and photos have been structured and re-arranged around the spatial reading presented above, mainly around the Lefebvrian spatial triad and the related concept of abstract space. As Czarniawska, (2004: 122) points out, this engagement with the material allows for making sense of events reported and allowing for
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a transition from incremental discovery to analytical abduction (Czarniawska, 2014), then transforming the messiness of the everyday observed into an analytical frame, with the potential to theorize.
6 Analyzing Camps

Thinking spatially about justice not only enriches our theoretical understanding, it can uncover significant new insights that extend our practical knowledge into more effective actions to achieve greater justice and democracy.

Obversely, by not making the spatial explicit and assertive, these opportunities will not be so evident (Soja, 2009: 1).

So, what then to make out of a thinking refugee camps both as spaces of establishing and established power relations, producing bare life and becoming the emblematic site of contemporary politics (the political space per se) on the one hand, as well as thinking them as being constantly on the move in themselves: never finished, ever changing. This is an especially pressing concern given the ambition laid down in the previous chapters, and in the spirit of Soja's quote above, to set about the analysis with a firm sense of spatial justice in mind. Here the camp is understood as a distinctive political space in which the apolitical figure of the refugee is inscribed into the political realm, implementing exclusion through its inclusion, but also, in Lefebvre's sense of space being produced, as a heterogeneous space that is always metamorphosing and overspilling attempts to manage it. So what seems paradoxical (the heterogeneity of the space and the potential absolute power over its inhabitants) becomes a guiding frame for the presentation and analysis of the findings.

This frame is settled upon in using Lefebvre's spatial triad. Here the messiness of the everyday is allowed in, without foreclosing on conceptual arranging and subsequent analysis. The material gathered during the field work is organized through the notions of perceived, conceived and lived space, to allow for a further investigation into the politics of the organization (the production and the producing momentums) of refugee camps. If I then,
in the following, present an analysis of the material through the spatial triad as mentioned in the previous chapter (the sections that follow will be distinguished by the triadic aspects of conceived, perceived and lived), this splitting of the space has to follow the format of the written text; nevertheless: an order, separation, or a hierarchy between different spaces within one should not be read into the structure of the text. The ordering of the material alongside and through the notions of perceived, conceived and lived space is merely an aesthetic one and not of a normative nature. To further loosen the ordering of presentation, and so better exemplify the spirit in which Lefebvre encourages empirical work be undertaken, I will use vignettes. These vignettes will be presented in the beginning of each section and then brought together through a short analyses or reading of the quotes, photos, incidents or atmospheres as metaphor or example for a respective spatial concept.
6.1 Orderings: conceived space

“We are tired, but we are forced to stay here [at the refugee camp]. This is a place with no future and no education [...] On this site, for whatever you want to do, you have to go to the camp manager and then either gives you a ‘Go’ or he doesn’t”.
A.S., camp inhabitant

G.T.: “On a daily basis: If you are here for 8 hours, you will spend about 5 with individual cases, housing problems, etc...”

M.S.: “Are all those cases within the refugee community or between the refugee community and the Ghanaian community?”

G.T.: “Mainly complete between refugees. And when I say between refugees, I am talking about all kinds of refugees. Not necessarily Liberian refugees alone. It may be between a Liberian and an Ivorian. So you have about 75% of all cases only between refugees. Then you have cases from the refugees complaining about some Ghanaians. You could also have a situation, where refugees have problems with landowners in the community. In certain cases, refugees have had to lease land, so to speak; this is the land of Ghanaians and they built houses on it. Under the agreement, that once we are leaving, I have built a house on your land, so it becomes yours. So I pay some small money, you have the houses become the landowner’s houses. And then, when you are doing those contracts, most of them thought they would only be here for just a few years. Nobody thought, they were going to stay for 20 years. The Liberians were thinking they would leave here, they were going to America in no time. The Ghanaians were thinking the war would be over within short time and they will move. So it was very easy to come to those conclusions. Only for them to realize they would be here for a long time. And then you realize you have not benefited from the land in a way you wanted and then it becomes a source of conflict. And such cases come to us. And then criminal cases also come. For example one person has assured other people that they will come to America, he collects money and then they realize that they have been persecuted. Their money is gone. Then they rush...
to the camp manager. Meanwhile, while they were making the deal, they did not involve the camp manager. Then there are also issues of people waiting to become the leaders of the refugee community, who will keep coming to the office, lying about other people.”

M.S.: “You were talking about the refugee community. What is this? Is there like a somewhat political...?”

G.T.: “Originally, according to the rules of refugee management, refugee camps must have leadership at the refugee level, which we call the welfare council. How the welfare council comes into being, is determined by the Refugee Management Board. In Ghana this is the Refugee Management Board. And before I came here, they organized themselves into political organizations, entities, which became very acrimonious, because it followed the lines, which created the war there. So camp management decided it would not have that kind of selection of leadership there anymore. So camp management had a particular leadership in place. So by the time they themselves make their appointments within this leadership. And some people think, that once you are in this leadership, it is very easy to get repatriated, resettled in America. And this is one of the reasons, why there was a crisis on the camp here in February 2011. So these are some of the issues one has to deal with.”

Excerpt from an interview with Gavavina Tamokloe, Camp Manager at Buduburam Refugee Settlement.
The Buduburam camp administration and management as presented at the Camp Managers office. The refugee management in Ghana of refugees mostly from Liberia and Sierra Leone is organized through a system of hierarchies: On top is the Ghana refugee board on the nation-state level; the camps themselves are administrated by Refugee Settlement Managers. Below in the hierarchy is the Refugee Welfare Council, consisting of refugees from the camp/settlement, which ought to engage in discussion with the refugee area.
committees and the refugee camp inhabitants on the one hand, and negotiate and discuss concerns vice versa with the refugee camp management.

The announcement of the dismissing of the Welfare Council, distributed and presented at central places at Buduburam Refugee Camp. All matters of concern of camp inhabitants are to be negotiated and discussed with the camp management itself. Direct representation of the refugee community, and
therefore the possibility to change, discuss and alter politics of the camp management through an organized entity is not taking place anymore.

The photos show scenes and moments from Buduburam Refugee Settlement, best subordinated and analysed through the notion of representation of space (perceived space). The outside of the Buduburam Refugee Settlement Management office with the SUV of the camp manager is on the left, next to the entrance of the camp, marked through a gate and guarded by member of the Neighbourhood Watch Group. Shadowing trees surrounds the office; the building itself is marked with signs and symbols of International Organizations and Donors, clearly visible to all inhabitants, surrounds the office. Three chairs outside serve as a waiting area for camp inhabitants, who would like to talk to the Camp Management.
Photo of a white SUV of NGO-members, visiting the camp management. Cars in general are a constant reminder of possibilities and impossibilities of movement and getting away, on top of being a symbol of wealth and power. Few streets within the camp can be used by cars, most of the areas of the camp are connected through smaller paths.
One of the more regular streets in the settlement, a space, which cannot be made use of by the cars above and which are exclusively for members of NGO’s or Camp Management. In the background, we see clothes hanging up to dry, after they have been washed in front of some of the huts of the camp site at Buduburam.
The big sign at the entrance of the camp, clearly visible from all sides for the Ghana Police and Fire Station Buduburam. The relationship between national refugee management, NGO’s (in this case the Christian Council of Ghana), executive force (the police) and International Organizations become visible.
The marking of one of the camp zones on the wall of a camp inhabitant’s housing. The camp is divided in areas and displays the evolvement and process of the constant changing nature of the site.

“When the crises in Liberia became most horrible, we had about 60000 refugees coming here. And therefore space became a problem – we had to enlarge the camp by zones 8, 9, 10 and 11, people moved beyond the original camp side and we had to enlarge the campgrounds therefore.

Gavavina Tamokloe, Camp Manager at Buduburam refugee settlement
To the left a photo of the marking on a house of a family on the campsite, indicating, that vaccination of the inhabitants has been carried out. To the right a photo of the entrance and the gate of camp and a member of the neighbourhood watch group.

“People [camp inhabitants] should have had flights to Liberia over the last couple of days. But nothing happened. So maybe the UNHCR will tell them tomorrow, when they will have to leave. UN is waiting for the answer from the Liberian government. When they get it, they will take busses, get them to Accra airport, give them some money for transportation in Accra and Monrovia and fly them to Monrovia and then transport them to different states. We will see how it going to be tomorrow – we will start working tomorrow whenever they [the UNHCR staff coming from the UNHCR head office in Accra] will get here. Maybe at 10:30, or 11 or 12 o’clock.”

C.R., camp inhabitant, working for the UNCHR voluntary repatriation office at the camp side.

What then to make of these (spatial) vignettes, when thinking them through the lenses of conceived space? The sheer amount of planning and ordering
of and through space becomes apparent: This ordering of space can take the
form of gates, systems of opening and closures, which are guarded and
protected, maintaining and upholding the distinctive character of the refugee
camp. The possibilities of enlarging the camp (when space became a
problem) and hence finding an answer in the extension of the practices
through an extension of the space on which they unfold as much as the
marking of houses of refugee families on the outside walls, visible for
neighbours, doctors, international staff and NGO members and camp
management. SUV’s and the roads, which they can use (and the roads, paths
and ways within the camp, which are not accessible to them) mark the
dominant space within the camp, or bare symbols of the forces of dominance
and power and the ways, in which those forces structure and infrastructure
the camp sites. Signs and Symbols of those dominant forces can be found
everywhere on the camp site, from the huge sign of the police and fire
station at the entrance, to the marking of material, foods, poster, buildings,
houses, clothing and so forth as being sponsored by the International
Community, Donors, NGO’s or camp management and hence not only
expressing a form of ownership (an ownership, which is reaching into every
spatial (and hence social) part of the camp, from private grounds to public
spaces, from schools to uniforms, from urinals to walls and gates, but also
inscribing these items, buildings and structures into the logic of the
dominant organizational forms of the camp. This is, at first, merely an
aesthetic argument: The spaces of the camp, which I hereby present as
dominant, do not speak to a political influence yet, but merely represent how
their presence is seen, felt and walked: An air condition or only a ventilator in
a house, which belongs as an office building to camp management or to an
International Organization makes the heat more bearable, it invites to stay
and rest and is yet not open and accessible for all (and if, then only for a
short moment, during a meeting for example). The streets which can be used
by cars are more even, walking seems to be more easy and light, less
garbage is laying around and one does not have to watch out for holes and
stones on the path. The surface of buildings, which are erected by the
International Community or International Organizations are smoother, they
follow a stricter aesthetic and architectural logic, then, for example, the
market stands or the houses of camp inhabitants. The signs of the Donors, NGO’s and camp management are printed and held in white, which is shining, compared to the red of the earth of streets and the colours of the houses, which do not seem to follow an aesthetic logic. One can clearly see, feel and witness the differences which come along with aesthetic representations of hierarchy and power: Ranging from some kind of uniform, which is worn by the members of the Neighbourhood Watch Group guarding the camp entrance and patrolling the streets of the camp, donated, collected and ordered in their matching of colours may be one example. The ordering through signs and colours, the organization of space through an inscription such as the sign of vaccination or the belonging to a respective to a certain camp area or zone, may be another. Yet one more, are the documents; such as the organization of the camp and the hierarchies between the organizational units involved, as well as the dismissal of the welfare council (the refugee representatives unit on the ground), as well as the dependency of camp inhabitants on the decision making processes supplied and orchestrated by the camp management office become enacted spatially. There is waiting time and space (marked by three white plastic chairs under a tree, next to a car) before the office of the camp manager, outside the building, whereas the governing and decision making itself takes place inside. Decisions often concern housing problems and questions of personal space within the camp, between refugees and, on the threshold, between refugees and neighbouring communities. Hierarchies and the displaying of dominant forces within the camp, can be seen, felt, heart (aesthetically tangible), through the spatial ordering and the ways, through with these hierarchies are displayed and informed through space.
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6.2 Orderings: Perceived Space

The photo shows a cartoon, which is directed to the camp inhabitants of Buduburam refugee camp in Ghana. It was created and distributed among the camp side by UNHCR and exhibited at one of the central display cases.

The cartoon shows a former refugee returning his refugee camp and following dialogue between him and camp inhabitants, who have not returned to their home country yet:

The Heading says: There is no place like home...

Refugee: „Hey, I can’t believe my eyes!“

Refugee: „Sam!.. When did you come to Ghana? Lang time ba..!!“

Returning Refugee: „I just arrived. I came with a message from home."

Returning Refugee: „Since 2004 Liberia enjoys renewed peace, we’ve an elected president, things are normal."

Later... (a group a refugees is gathering around the returning refugee)

Returning Refugee:“ Go home and see Liberia yourselves, Lib can only be built by you and myself. So let’s go home. Don’t wait fort he last bus or plane to leave."
Two woman out of the group of refugees: „Yeah O!!“ „Da true!“
Returning refugee: „My people it is time to go home. There is no place like home. Home sweet home. The refugee business here will end soon.“

“I used to be a business woman in Liberia, but it all changed when the war reached the countryside where I was living in 1990. I was hiding with my family, my husband and my three children in the bush, but it wasn’t save there, there were rebel group coming into the countryside, searching for people. So we fled to Monrovia, trying to escape from there to another country, but by the time we arrived there, the war reached the city as well. It was the time, when Samuel Doe was captured and killed by Prince Johnson and shortly after Charles Taylor arrived in the city as well, and it all resulted in intense fighting. It was during these shootings, that I lost my husband and two of my children, while we were trying to escape the killings, but they were shot in a house in Monrovia. I escaped with my one child left to me and was rescued by ECOMOG forces, I think they were Nigerian soldiers, who brought me to their basis.”
C.R., Bububuram Refugee Settlement
The photo above on page 138 (and the following ones) show the preparation of the distribution of material, which the successful graduates of Woman empowerment schools were about to receive from a variety of perspectives: The first photo on the previous page shows women waiting outside the school building, in which the distribution ought to happen. These women have successfully mastered classes for example in backing, cooking or sewing. The distribution of material (such as flower and baking soda, garments and needles), as a reward for the successful accomplishment and as a starting mean for becoming entrepreneurial figures themselves, ought to have started early in the morning. Due to late arrival of the responsible NGO members, women have been waiting outside on the street for hours, chatting and discussing, being nerved and yet laughing in between.
The photo shows the heads of the woman empowerment schools inside the building, amongst the commodities to be distributed. They have also been waiting, but firstly, after they gathered at one of the schools and then jointly moving to the distribution center.
The photo shows the gathering of the woman, who have been waiting out on the street around the NGO representative, who tells them with few words and without any further explanation, that the distribution will not take place this day and that they are to be informed about process in the future.

“The first time I arrived in Ghana, it was in Accra. We arrived with a boat from Ivory Coast, me and my wife and our daughter, 5 months by that time. From Accra, the Ghanaian Government carried us to a refugee camp in the western region. First we only had tents, but the UNHCR later on built houses for us. After the election [in Liberia], we went back, thinking that the war was over. We were repatriated by the UNCHR, we were travelling on the road. We came back to Paynesville [a suburb of Monvoria] in 1997. [...] We had to return to Ghana in 2002, when the war reached Monrovia again”.

A.S., camp inhabitant
Camp inhabitants are waiting for the arrival of staff members of the UNHCR, which are arriving from Accra on a twice a week schedule. The office, in the buildings in the background, is closed at this moment. People are waiting to discuss the conditions and possibilities as well as possible support from the UNCHR regarding their repatriation. Outside the offices, shadowing few benches with white UNCHR tents, a waiting space and area is created. The shade is shifting with the sun, moving and hence organizing the movement of the people waiting outside. They are surrounded by a fence, which separates them on the inside of the camp from the outside around them. Yet, through the fence, from the street, camp inhabitants are clearly visible, the offices themselves remain closed to the outside. UNHCR staff is arriving two hours late, due to heavy traffic, as one of the UNHCR members later on in an interview states.

“If life was really normal, it would not be something to be really proud of.”

J., camp inhabitant about his shop on the border of the Buduburam refugee camp
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“Yes, I am being very nicely dressed, I have to do this for office work from Monday until Thursday, only on Friday, I can be casual.”
C.Y, camp inhabitant, working for the Camp Management

Photo showing the inside of the office space of the neighbourhood watch group; a member of the neighbourhood watch group shows the uniforms they are using, while patrolling or guarding the camp gate. The colours are held in blue and brown, clothes have been donated and are now used as a uniform for the Neighbourhood watch group, which guards the camp entrance and patrols the camp at night. The payment for their services is better food rations and treatment, which would otherwise only be accessible for, in the humanitarian language,
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groups of most-vulnerable people, such as woman, children, elderly, disabled, etc. as well as better access to decision makers on the camp side.

A photo of a poster, warning camp inhabitants that they are to be arrested for false visa, false birth certificates, and false bank statements. Such openly displayed legal warnings, reminders of ‘rightful’ behaviour and control sheets for ought to ought not to be done, are an incremental, reoccurring and omnipresent way of addressing camp inhabitants.
Above a photo of an information sheet, which announces a “profiling exercise” (i.e. the collection of photos, finger prints and personal data) for camp inhabitants. The photo displays the interconnection between International Organizations (i.e. UNHCR) and National Camp Management (i.e. the Government of Ghana) on the one hand, but also hints at the impossibility of rejecting certain policy measures, as well as linking those to the discursive practices of humanitarian speech (e.g. “durable solutions”) and also the pressure mechanism, which come along the announcement and execution of policy practices.
“When I first fled from Liberia, we were living in a forest, later on we got tents from the UNHCR and the Ghanaian government. At this time, relationships between the refugees were good, we were helping each other and organized water and food distribution. The camp changed over time, people started to build houses, around 1991 – 1993. And some think of themselves as refugees, others think of themselves as migrants, others are asylum seekers by now. I am an asylum seeker, I just received my official card; the status is better than being a refugee. “

S.K., camp inhabitant

Closely related to conceived space, we shall understand the vignettes above as examples or metaphors of perceived space; as a translation, a reiteration and re-enactment of the ordering practices of dominant forces, which perpetually organize and enact the camp. These spatial practices can be seen (and heard and felt) as an echo of the Representations of space described and outlined in and as conceived space. A cartoon, displayed at a public space within the camp, turns into a translation of the policies of camp administration and international community: the narrating voice becomes one of a returning refugee, while the content of the speech displays the politics of International Community and of the Ghanaian Government (refugee’s should be returning). Instead of an obvious forceful way for this message to be perceived, it is hidden in the notion of a potential last bus or plane to leave, which ought not be missed). The personal (his)stories of fleeing are stories of subordination into perceived spaces and hence become a personal enactment into the dominant spaces of society and spatial practices (running away from war, turning onto a ship, entering camps, repatriation and again, fleeing and entering camps). The position of advancing the repatriation of refugees is being told through themselves: Ironically, many of the refugees I have talked to, had returned to Liberia after the end of the first civil war, following the calls and organization of the former camp management and the assessment of the situation in their home country by the International Community. After having experienced a second
fleeing after the breakout of the second Liberian civil war in the early 2000’s and after returning to Buduburam (a camp, many have stayed before), the willingness to return is limited and the ever-present signs and documents stating political stability and an outlook for prosperity upon returning to their country of origin are perceived critically and with doubt. Waiting outside an UNHCR office in a designated waiting space as well as the use of the street (which can be used by NGO SUV’s) as a space for waiting for hundreds of women decisions to be made by NGO administration for hours in the sun are a spatial externalisation of the politics of the camp; defining and showing dependencies and hierarchies within the camp and a (re)structuring and production of the policies through space: The space of waiting transforms itself through the movement of the sun and the hence the shade; people move, benches become more or less inviting as a space to remain. The signs and symbols and colours of International Organizations, the blue and white of the UNHCR frame, differently and yet similar to the people working and representing such organizations, the camp inhabitants. Refugees waiting outside the container office buildings, which are both, manifest and temporal in themselves, are waiting on a different level: steps have to be climbed to enter the offices whenever they are opened to them. Numerous spatial practices and enactments of orders, laws and regulations through space can be seen, ranging from the uniform giving out the Neighbourhood watch group as a camp-like policing unit (patrolling the camp and guarding the gate in three shifts), to warnings of illegal activities and legal status and the changes which of such status. Such differentiation of status and the impossibilities of shifting one selves from refugee to asylum seeker ensure a continuity of the social: A perception of the everyday within the camp, ensuring the social ordering and order within the space of the camp: A shop, a small business, is not then not just an enterprise, but also serves as a constant reminder of the exceptional situation (and space), within which and through which the shop is being erected.
6.3 Orderings: Lived space

Oru refugee camp, about 100 km northeast of Nigeria’s largest city, Lagos, presents itself as a run-down place in shabby conditions – at least with regard to the facilities of the International Organizations: The former UNHCR representatives office, prominently located at the entrance of the camp, lacks a roof. The only remaining hint to its former use is the blue coloured UNCHR symbol above the former entrance – one amongst three holes in the walls (previously windows and doors) of the now unused house.

Right behind it, though, there is life. These houses are maintained and signs of their use can be seen from the outside: Smoke from cooking, laundry hanging outside, people sitting in front of the doors and under the surrounding trees in the shade. Oru is not a refugee camp anymore, but then again, it still is. The camp was set up in 1990 and served as an emergency response camp to host the fleeing refugees from the first Liberian civil war, and later for refugees from Sierra Leone and Ivory Coast as well. It was closed by the Nigerian authorities and the International Community in 2012, resulting in the return of most of the camp inhabitants to their home countries, or so it was envisioned.
Oru refugee camp from its entrance gate, with the former UNHCR office building in the front and with the houses of the remaining camp inhabitants (occupants) in the background.

Nevertheless, when I arrive at Oru on a hot early afternoon, I am greeted by a group of women who are sitting near the entrance and chatting with each other under the shade of a tree. Soon, a group of male Liberians comes over, and we start talking about them still being in the camp, even though the international and Nigerian support to its inhabitants has been suspended. Oru is an occupied space, appropriated by former camp inhabitants themselves, those who have not returned to Liberia yet and through their occupation try to gain access to better means for their repatriation. The people I am talking to, are all from Liberia – about 800 of them are still on the camp site. They demand support from UNHCR for their repatriation, claiming that promises have been made which have not been kept, such as financial support and providing means for a reintegration into the Liberian society.
Samuel Morgen, who calls himself Shadow (as a reference to his arrival at Buduburam at a young age, only with his own shadow accompanying him), is a now 29-year old Liberian refugee, who came to Ghana in March 2002, after having fled the Liberian civil wars. He was able to finish High School at the Camp, but didn’t find any occupation at Buduburam and reflects upon this time as “doing nothing on the camp was really bad”. So he decided “to go for music, writing songs and singing for other people for money or food”. He had the chance to go to Ghana’s capital Accra, where a friend of his had a recording studio, where he worked on his first album “My Time to Shine”, followed by his second album “Peace must be real”. Samuel Morgen has been collecting money from international donors in order to establish a music studio in Buduburam, which is now used not only to record and produce songs but is known to be a meeting place mostly for young people from the camp. “People in Liberia have said, that the youth is useless. I want to prove them wrong after 17 years of war. The youth is the future. This is the reason why I organize a lot for the youth community at Buduburam, invite them here and help them to make music and educate them about Liberia—especially those, who were not born in Liberia or grew up here in Ghana.”
Apart from hosting people at his recording studio, which is located on one of the main streets leaving the central square of Buduburam, creating an open and welcoming space even though it is small (the actual recording room is about 3 square meters), Samuel Morgan is promoting events on the Buduburam camp site, for example for Liberia's national day, when he and a large group of younger camp inhabitants perform music and organize parties.

These observations stand in sharp contrast to the arrangement of the camp authorities' facilities: Hospitals and schools are located in the centre of the camp, the camp management office as well as the UNCHR repatriation centre lie at the entrance of the gate, all of these facilities with excess to streets – still mud roads, but wide enough for cars to pass through. Most of these places, the UNHCR and camp management office for example, do not
have an inviting set-up but a waiting area outside the facility, from which people are called in to discuss their issues (such as repatriation, neighborhood struggles and so forth). As restricted areas, these places enact the hierarchy of the organizational ordering of the settlement. However, as Shadow's studio shows, the clear-cut spatial arrangements of ordering are not only shot through with the everyday routines of spatial practices needed to uphold them. They can also be turned into lived spaces of parties and music-making.

Women of a woman empowerment school get together after a backing class; the topics under discussion here, are personal matters, as well matters of repatriation, the camp management, the dismissal of the welfare council, the role of the elders council, the issue of safety upon a possible return to Liberia, etc.
A scene just outside the camp border and the entrance area; shops and a market between the camp side and the street and the bus station. T-shirts and water is being sold on movable market stands.
An advertisement sign, advocating one of the many churches on the camp ground, promoting: "Prophecy, Healing and Financial Uplifting".
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A private house in the camp side, the woman (on the bed to the right, which is not visible in the photo) has just given birth to a child.

Thirdly, the above outlined vignettes, quotes, photos atmospheres and stories account for lived space – the representational. These can be of an obvious nature or hidden within the spaces of the camp. Obvious or hidden, but allowing for differentially enacted and lived lives and spaces to unfold, these lived spaces are made visible and tangible, these lives spaces are indeed embedded and produced nowhere else, but in the spaces analysed above and do yet differentiate themselves: The open door to a record studio then stands in sharp contrast to the perceived space of the closed door with people waiting for hours on streets, under tents and next to the cars of camp management or NGO staff members, hence turning a record studio into a meeting place for younger people and moving and questioning the boundaries of private and public space within the camp; furthermore what is being produced in the studio finds its way out, to the central squares of the camp during festivals and concerts and even beyond through distribution via digital channels such as YouTube, connecting the practices of music production to the production and (temporal) occupation of different spaces and the hinting at a development and reconfiguration of a political and social identity. A camp, once serving as a regular side of enclosure and inclusion, a
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depoliticized space of humanitarian action, is turned through its occupation into a side of political resistance and outreach, political awareness and consciousness, turning the logics of the space around, by making it political, while leaving out any humanitarian connotation or practice. (Small) symbols and signs of the lived can be found all over camp sides: One of the small stores on the border of the camp, open to the street and the bus station, approachable by Ghanaians and bypasses and camp inhabitants alike, is hence transcending the borders of the camp, not only opening up for a different usage of space, but also hinting at and self-advocating a different understanding of refugees beyond a perception as victims and helpless masses, referring to a potentially entrepreneurial self. Both advertisements we have come across, the one for dating as well as for religious practices, fall out of the ordering and control of camp administrations and not conveying to the rules and organization of the camp, also displayed in different aesthetics (colourful and very much advertising, as well as plain black and white, born, as it seems, out of a necessity), again, just like a market stand, they show a more complex reality of the everyday of camp inhabitants and yet go beyond a potential simplification of these lived spaces as being purely liberated from homogeneous renderings: Why, for example, may we ask, does the dating advertisement specifically refer to afro-dating as the exotic, aiming at European man? The home in which a woman is giving birth to a child does similarly create a space in which the mere presence of new-born life and its existence disrupts the logic of the homogenisation of space, we have encountered before and challenging questions of identity, country of origin and repatriation. The (different) use of (conceived) spaces of woman empowerment schools turns them into sites of political discussion and providing a space, which constitutes its importance beyond backing, knitting or cooking classes. These examples and vignettes portray temporary depictions, organization and productions of lived spaces. As different or heterogeneous these examples may be (and as different these heterogeneities display themselves regarding a discussion of the possibilities of politics, as we will see), they are unified through their character of creating an otherness within and against dominant representations of space.
6.4 Towards Politics of Contingent Foundations

The discussion of an ordering of the spaces of the space of the camp shall not end at this moment, but is going to be transferred and translated into a discussion on how to organize the heterogeneity of space of the camp into certain logics, which are embedded in the social production of the camp. I will hence break up again the clustering of the space of the camp in conceived, perceived and lived spaces, but, while keeping them in the background, try to detect and organize the analyses through the identification of a set of paradoxes, which are inherent and ontological to the organization and production of refugee camps and its metamorphoses. In order to do so, I will firstly engage in a discussion of an understanding postfoundational political thought, which informs the possibilities of thinking the political difference under chapter 7) Producing Paradoxes and the Possibilities of Politics finally open for an understanding of refugee camps as sites, which bear the potential of producing other politics, or: the political.
7 Producing Paradoxes and the Possibilities of Politics

If the space of the camp is threefold: conceived, perceived and lived it is, for Lefebvre, inevitably a space of contradictions and heterogeneity, because, no matter how intensely enforced, the struggle to homogenize a space (by bureaucratic imposition of visual senses, of geometric measurement, and violent symbolism) a space, the lives through which the space is being continually produced always upset the strived for order. The camp – the camps I studied awhile - can be imagined as the worldly and immanent presentations of space that the stage design for Castorf’s play ‘Reise ans Ende der Nacht’ presented in all its abstract intensity, notably the centrality of the ‘gate’. Aleksander Denic’s stage design still stands on stage of the Residenztheater. And it still takes us in the supposedly the African village as the place of the spectacle. And still, the two wooden, black and white gate poles hold a metal frame with a Swung through which we still encounter the slogan of the French revolution 1789: Liberté, Egalite, Fraternité. It may still be an uncanny image, and image which provokes and organizes contradictions, concerns and confusion. But precisely therefore this may indeed be one way of not silencing the ambivalent and paradoxical enactments of refugee camps. The gateway is the signature of presence configured as a threshold, the quivering moment between inside and outside that was also the threshold identified by Agamben as what configures and embodies the fundamentally restless and opaque and necessarily contradictory nature of the camp.

Could it then be helpful to try to understand this production of the camp space through the gate? The gate opens the space to power and even terror, as well as in its being passed to the potential overcoming or dissolving and transforming of such power. It is the embodiment of attempts to align conceived and perceived space that then, in being used and re-used refuses such steadying alignments. And what to make of this threshold that can live
only as a contradiction? Is this contradiction of necessary nature and embedded in the production of the space of the camp (and so political modernity then) and does this allow for a thinking of politics behind and through the gate at all? And which kinds of politics then does it present?

Though the gate the refugee camp indeed presents a space and an ordering, which is based both on absent grounds and a solid world. The solid worlds on which it stands are marked by its boundaries, the fences and walls, the streets and quarters as well as on the framing of the subject, its ordering and inclusion into an order (any order). And it stands on absent grounds, which are marked in the same way – through its boundaries, the fences and walls, the streets and quarters as well as on the framing of the subject, its ordering and inclusion into an order (any order). The gate embodies all this disorientation.

And orientation matters. As Kafka's K. shows, it is important where we are, even more so when the space where we are located is functioning a priori and a posteriori through the exclusion (as in ‘The Castle’) of its surrounding. The camp functions thus: a homogenising attempt at inclusion through security measures, medical care, certificates and registrations, company and food rations. And so where we are remains of importance, and this is especially true for those, who cannot voluntarily decide where they are (or want to stay or go or become). Whereas K. believes he has the possibility of movement (and be moved as a contingent character in a contingent time of Austria-Hungary, seeking closure) this appearance is itself an upshot of where he is, which is neither inside nor outside the Castle or its accompanying village, always both, and never sure of which, and always liable to censure, but by whose authority? K. too is on a threshold, a precarious space which is the space of modernity with its fractures and fragments, and the camp, the camps spoken of at length in the last two chapters, seem to be equally precarious and ambivalent spaces.

So how to use concepts to analyse them, being aware that, as was said in chapter 2, using concepts to study such phenomena as camps can too
readily and easily reduce and belittle this precariousness. This was also Taussig’s point about theory discussed in chapter 5. His problematization of theory serves as a valid entry point for a discussion of the limitations and possibilities of theorizing and bringing together theory and the contingent, concrete and particular of the messiness of the world it seeks to describe, read or make sense of. Indeed, in the spirit of Taussig, I hope this chapter adds to a mastery of the non-mastery of reflecting on the organization of refugee camps.

In order to do so, I will first take a step back into Agamben’s discussion of the camp, which I set within a broader discussion of politics and the political. This ought to be done, for two reasons: Firstly, I seek to engage more in depth with the notion of politics, a term which has been a guiding and grounding thread in this study and which I now wish to bring out more distinctly into the patterns of the argument. Secondly, through Agamben the coming together of space and the political then allows me to better being out the themes I find in my empirical material and which then talk back to what it is for a camp to be organized and organize.

As I suggested in chapter 2, the notion of politics seemed to have reached an endpoint in the mid1990’s, when Francis Fukuyama famously declared the end of history (1992). Now, almost 20 years later, politics is resurgent, and appears in concentrated form in and around the continually vexed experience of creating and using camps for refugees, an experience that has drawn comparison with many other forms of contemporary political expression, notably movements such as Occupy, the variety of groups and nationalities of people and uprising movements that formed what has become known as the Arab Spring or the Ejército Zapatista de Liberación Naciona (EZLN). These developments, both as actual and factual events in history, but also as an intellectual and theoretical (re)thinking of politics, are, as I have suggested when discussing Butler, being situated within a discussion of post foundational political thought, where the possibility of a resolution of views or unity in forms seems impossible to envisage. This brings Agamben’s work to the fore.
Perhaps because of its treating the post foundational condition I alluded to seriously, and as a profound provocation, Agamben’s work has met criticism from a variety of angles: For example, his work has been described as a dark analyses of our times (Liska, 2008: 7), for leaving not enough space (sic!) for an empirical engagement and analysis of refugee camps and by providing a vocabulary which limits the possibilities of describing and understanding the complexity of camps (Inhetveen, 2010: 35-36), for a methodological overstretching of the historical material (ranging from ancient roman legal figures to the National Socialistic State) he draws from and therefore for facing the danger of falling into a historic-philosophical logic of doom (Marchart, 2010: 223-224), for its harsh critique of the nation state and the impossibility of thinking the possibilities of democratic change (Jenkins, 2004) or for reducing refugees to mere biopolitical subjects (Owens, 2009). Potentially though, the most pointed critique is indeed embedded in the discussion of his work relating it the political difference, namely brought forth by Oliver Marchart (2010).40

Under the influence of Guy Debord Agamben concludes that indeed society becomes spectacle: Democracy and capitalism are all-encompassing, creating an omniferous condition of all (political) life. Yet it is within such diagnoses of totalitarianism as the spectacle of commodity, though hard to imagine, where the potential for emancipation (the political) could unfold and become fulsome (Marchart, 2010: 225 – 226). ‘Auschwitz as the paradigm of everything’ - under this somewhat provoking title, Marchart discusses the political difference in the work of Giorgio Agamben and picks up on a critique on Agamben’s work (most notably on his Homo Sacer trilogy). To re-iterate from chapter 3 a little: Agamben’s de-historicisation of the camp, or the deconstruction of the relationship between certain camp forms and their socio-historical embedding, resolving in an all-encompassing logic of the camp as paradigm of political modernity, is to Marchart the most obvious

40 The discussion of the work of Giorgio Agamben in the English edition from 2007 is missing completely. Even though Agamben is mentioned as one of the thinkers of the Heideggerian left, the English edition lacks the chapter on the “Political Difference without Politics: Giorgio Agamben”, which has been added (amongst a chapter on Jacques Rancière and a more thorough discussion of Ernest Laclau) to the German edition published 3 years later.
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problem of the Agambian theoretical endeavour.\textsuperscript{41} The parallelization of Auschwitz (as symbol and metaphor for the system of National Socialistic Concentration- and Extermination camps) to all other forms of camps, ranging from gated communities, to Guantanamo and Abu Ghaib, to refugee camps, to zones d´attente to the outskirts of our cities, creates an omnipresence of the space of the camp, which to Marchart cannot be resolved. To understand a camp – to understand being in a camp – it is insufficient to follow Agamban’s logic - referring to Benjamin’s and Kierkegaard’s dictum - that, in order to understand a rule, we have to think it from its exception. The notion, that “perhaps […] we are all virtually homines sacri” is surely problematic, if the analysis of the homo sacer draws from and situates him/her/us both from and in Chelmno and Cruise ships? It is surely too broad to make it fruitful for any political or emancipatory movement. Yet, Agamben offers salvation through this all-encompassing darkness. As Marchart remarks, the only escape or rescue lies within a pure politics of the messianic, for, in light of the omnipotent presence of the state of spectacle and the form of the camp as political paradigm, only messianic hope remains (2010: 232). If political power has always constituted itself in the last instance through the separation of the homo sacer from the context of forms of life, a “form-of-life” would constitute a “life that can never be separated from its form, a life in which it is never possible to isolate something such as naked life.” (Agamben, 2000: 9) For forms of life, to constitute themselves as form-of-life, intellectuality and thought are the precondition and power “that incessantly reunites life to its form or prevents it from being disassociated with it (2010: 10).

In order to orientate such a life, which cannot be turned into naked life, Agamben draws on Walter Benjamin’s thought (on language, as only then being pure, if it is not occupied by an end, but only presents itself and works as a mean, by defining the sphere of the political as a sphere in which precisely this “being-into-a-mean [becomes] a condition of human beings:

\textsuperscript{41} This criticism is reflected, for example, in the aforementioned problematisation of translating the Agambian discourse onto empirical studies and adds to a reading of his philosophy as dark in a double sense: Firstly in his diagnoses of our times and secondly in the potential problem of not being able to shed light on other politics, resulting and produced through camps.
Politics is the exhibition of a mediality: it is the act of making a means visible as such. Politics is the sphere neither of an end in itself not of means subordinated to an end; rather, it is the sphere of a pure mediality without end intended as a field of human action and of human thought” (Agamben, 2010: 117 - 118). The critique, which is being brought forth here, relates the lack of any strategic momentum, which constitutes itself in a form-of-life as politics without end (and a pure mean). Agamben’s critique does not relate itself to the detachment of such kind of politics from organizational forces, a kind of politics which does not dissolve into a technical-political sphere of organizing politics; rather, the critique hints at the necessity of an (or a multiplicity of) end(s), if political struggle is being carried out on a terrain of uneven and changing structures of power and ordering (Marchart, 2010: 236 - 237). The alleged reduction of politics to the “Auschwitz as the paradigm of everything” and a constitution of politics without political momentum (without a strategic momentum which constitutes itself against struggles in the presence), leads to a thinking of the political as a messianic becoming, a “Politics of the Political instead of a Political Politics” (Marchart, 2010: 239): Instead of a messianic hope for salvation through a mere mean, it must, so Marchart argues, include a mosaic imperative; god may lead, but the way out of Egypt must be found by oneself (Marchart, 2010: 239). This messianic hope is embedded in the state of exception as well (so the salvation is embedded in the same concept, which brings the necessity for the messianic salvation forth): "From the juridico-political perspective, messianism. is therefore a theory of the state of exception -- except for the fact that in messianism there is no authority in force to proclaim the state of exception; instead, there is the Messiah to subvert its power" (Agamben, 2010: 40).

Therefore, a problem, embedded in the discussion of the political difference in Agamben’s work (even though this difference is never made explicit), is hence constituted also in the embedded difficulty of the (im)possibilities to articulate, co-ordinate and organize social ordering beyond their social ordering (and hence to articulate, co-ordinate and organize the political).
I have argued that a way out of this trap lies with a return to the work of Lefebvre: Even though potentially made fruitful only in an instrumental way, Lefebvre’s offering of the practice-theoretical analyses of space as lived, perceived and conceived spaces bear in themselves the possibility to locate and discuss those organizing forces which constitute a political difference in space and therefore also the possibilities of an emancipatory political. Lefebvre allows us to do justice to the solid world, which is both the world out there (which indeed is the contingent, the concrete and the particular to recall Taussig’s thought on the relationship between theory and empirics from the beginning of this chapter) but also the foundation we find not despite, but because of thinking postfoundationally.

So in analysing my empirical material I am investigating the possibilities of a political difference within and through refugee camps. For such an understanding of politics in the organization of refugee camps, I continue to draw on the Lefebvrian spatial triad outlined in the methodological chapter. This serves as the basis for bringing together the discussion of the political difference and the analyses of space, making this discussion fruitful for an opening of reading the camp as a space of different politics (which I organize under a series of paired concepts: humanitarianism and governance; the permanent and temporary; order and localization, power and resistance, organization and disorganization). Then finally I elaborate on the possibilities of politics. The empirics have been necessary in this very important regard, for only from within them can I get a sense of what Marchant (2010: 237) argues is the “impure” nature of political action, an engagement (theoretical or practically) with political action that is equivalent to making one’s hand dirty (Marchart, 2010: 237). Only then, from the ground of what s being lived out – a being there - can an analysis allow for thinking an emancipatory political without diminishing the ordering effects of the politics enacted within and through the space of the camp. Rancière’s notion of politics (to be understand as the political, in contrast and struggling with his notion of the police as politics) as manifestation of a dissensus – two worlds in one - , is being exemplified through the ordering of a demonstration by the police, or more precisely, the break-up of an
demonstration, cumulating in a call to the public, which is: “move on, there is nothing to see”. Politics (the political), Rancière writes, on the contrary consist in a transformation and refiguring of this space “into the space of thee appearance of a subject: the people, the worker, the citizens”. And camp inhabitants we may add. “It is in re-figuring space, that is in what can be done, to seen and to be named in it. It is the instituting of a dispute over the distribution of the sensible, over the némén that founds every nomos of the community.” There is an interesting intellectual proximity to the work of Agamben, which can be found in these lines, which also expresses itself through the use of similar rhetoric and conceptualizations: Agamben’s coming community (as a mean without end, the messianic politics) finds its equivalent in Rancière’s notion of the community (as the – potentially only temporal – emancipation of and through politics, the political)\textsuperscript{42}. The notion two world in one, through which this community is established (the same street which is scene for action for the police, sets the scene for action to become political subject) hints at Agamben’s notion, that the messianic is only coming into being through the very same space and order, it is dominated and suppressed by, the state of exception. Almost needless to say, the question of the political difference in both cases, is a spatial one, finding its expression through the terminology of nomos. If the essence of politics, lies in the “demonstration (manifestation) of a gap in the sensible itself”, then this sensible is also always a matter of space, indeed a matter of proper space as the basis for political configuration (Rancière, 2010: 37 - 38).

\textsuperscript{42} I will return to the conceptualization of the community as en expression and manifestation of the political as emancipatory politics and the difference herein in the work of Giorgio Agamben and Jacques Rancière respectively in the following, outlining a critique of Agamben’s coming community, which is situated in a critique of the messianic momentum outlined above.
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Humanitarianism and Governance:

“The gradually constructed convergence between the history of refugee camps and that of humanitarianism finds expression in the number, diversity and reproduction of the camp form, with humanitarian activists being the managers […]. It is fully realized, the fragmentation of the world of which humanitarian government is one of the means will probably avoid direct conflict and make it possible to repel these, orient them and contain them.”

(Agier, 2011: 206 – 207)

As if the vast flood of refugees and the spread of refugee settlements all over the world would not be enough to remind the study of organization to engage with such matters of sociopolitical concern, we are reminded here, that to Agamben refugee camps are both the origin and today’s visible manifestation of a more generalized ‘zone of indistinction’ (2000: 40): “We should not forget that the first camps were built in Europe as spaces controlling refugees, and that the succession of internment camps – concentration camps – extermination camps represents a perfectly real filiation” (2000: 22). In this “perfectly real filiation”, for Agamben the figure of the refugee has become the central figure of political development. It stands for the ontological condition of a suspended legal and political status as identified by Hannah Arendt (2008: 605): “There is no one that can guarantee the very human rights, which were granted to them”. The refugee is deprived of rights, then, his or her only property is being human as such – Agamben’s ‘Homo Sacer’, who, again, is nothing but ‘bare life’. The paradox of the rights of those who have no rights and the spread of bare life rupture the bond between the classic notions of human being and citizen, push the principles of the nation state into crisis and, Agamben argues, demand a revision of our notions of community and the political. The camp in general, and the refugee settlement in particular, is the space where this crisis manifests itself most visibly. And this crisis can be expressed through the camp as a space, in which the tensions of the falling together of humanitarian action on the one side, and of processes of governance on the
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other, come into being.

Humanitarianism expresses itself spatially for example through the distribution of food and water rations, sponsored clothes, housing and schools, kindergarten, hospitals, distribution of medication and vaccination, just to mention a few of the manifestations of ‘good work’ I encountered. The signs and symbols of these humanitarian actions are present throughout Oru and Buduburam they are distributed and displayed on all items, infrastructure, mobile and immobile devices, through the language of signs and of orders, and the subordination of human beings under their structuring procedures that organize the site of the camp in a double sense: On the one hand as means of help and support, on the other hand as governing force, which inscribes the camp inhabitants into the logic of a ruling system, in this case of the United Nations.

To paraphrase in spatial terms: The potential for the potentiality of lived spaces is often subordinated under and twists itself into - becoming - the logics of the dominant space of society. These dominant spaces, to reflect on and refer to the opening quote of Agier, orient and contain a world, through a fragmentation into spheres of humanitarian action, which only can be maintained through a governing alongside its logics: The logics and the politics of such ordering is being (re)produced through governing the inhabitants of such spaces (and organizing these spaces) indeed as spaces of exceptionality, as spaces of exception, or, as Lefebvre notion would account, as abstract spaces. There is an attempt continually to remove Oru and Buduburam from ‘being there’ to ‘being anywhere’. The fragmentation of the world, and then the rendering of homogeneity of the worlds of refugee camps, falls together precisely through the avoidance of conflicts between a humanitarianism on the one hand and the governance through which this world is being upheld on the other. These processes of unification between the humanitarianism and governance fall together and become apparent in the space of the camp, they become visible and tangible, they are present through the everyday and absolute presence of the signifiers of this ordering, the symbols, signs and language of humanitarian action, according to the
“rationality of the identical and repetitive” (Lefebvre, 2003/1970: 86) and we hence “enter into a world of combinations whose every element is known and recognized” (Lefebvre 2009/1980: 212-213). These symbols and signs and words were everywhere in Oru and Buduburam, indeed often enough the camps were nothing more than them.

We might call these processes the establishment of a humanitarian order, which comes not only into being based on a set of beliefs, but indeed an organizational (spatial) practices as Agier denotes (2011: 2010). This humanitarian order is embedded in and only possible through the logics of a state of emergency, which "sets up its [own] administration" (Virilio, 2007: 16), one that was clearly felt by major western powers and the United Nations when in the wake of multiple an continual displacements, the solution of the camp proffers itself as an administered response (including the setting up of Oru and Buduburam) to an apparently permanent state of exception. This administration presents the falling together, a shared and common identity between two sides of refugee policies and ordering of worlds: the treatment of refugees (as victims, to recall one of the main social figures of refugees presented in chapter 2) and the control of and over a group of people, exercised not against, but alongside the notion, rhetoric and practices of treatment, help and support, it is at one and the same time “a hand that strikes and a hand that heals” (Agier, 2010: 200). And it is only through being a potential and often actualized paradox in itself, a form and means of support and care on the one side, and a form and mean of suppression and dominance on the other, that the inhabitants of camps can be constructed and ordered as what they ought to be (whether for the time being that may be victims, entrepreneurs, villains or the undesired other) and that the roles can be changed and shifted. Refugees can become employees and asylum seekers, they can be occupants or political figures in the form of spokesperson and representatives – but an embedded potential of shifts in the roles camp inhabitants are inscribed in and inscribe themselves to, is inherent to dissensus arising between humanitarianism and governance.
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The Permanent and Temporary

“Home is security, I say. At home we are in full command of the dialectics of knowledge and recognition, of trust and confidence, Since we know them, we recognize them and we trust ourselves to speak and act – for we may have justified confidence in our knowledge and recognition.”

(Amery, 1980: 47)

Jean Amery writes these lines in light of his experiences as an inmate of concentration camps Auschwitz, Bergen-Belsen and Dachau in his memoir 'At the minds limits, contemplations by a survivor of Auschwitz and its realities'. Home is a space (not a place), which allows the subject to speak and act, based on the security of having command over knowledge, trust and confidence; home hence is the space, in which, to remind us of the earlier reference to Rancière, where the individual can appear as political subject through community. For a refugee camp to become such site, the paradox of temporality and permanence needs to be determined and discussed for it is precisely this ambiguity between an alleged temporality and the manifestations of permanence (legal, social, political, spatial), that produce or resist this becoming of the political subject. Recalling Lefebvre’s analyses, that “time is not separated from space, rather it orientates space”, there seems to be something important about how time is organized and produced through the camp (Lefebvre, 1991/1974: 267).

From my experience at Oru and Buduburam the gathering of permanence and the temporary unfolds on two levels. First comes its spatial enactment (and hence the politics it produces and is produced by and the everyday it constitutes): the camp is constituted in its inner logics as a space of temporality, ones that pass and disappear and the reminders of this temporality are ever-present, enacted and organized: “Don’t wait for the last bus or plane to leave” and “the refugee business (sic) is going to end soon” the cartoon says, gesturing toward repatriation as, allegedly a durable refugee policy. In actuality, it is the one I encountered least, yet this is the most prominent and present form of attempting to end the refugee
business, one continually being promoted and advertised, organized through office spaces, and expounded by staff members dedicated only to this policy. For example when the teacher of an elementary school class, whose pupils were all born in the camp tells me: “Clearly, all the parents perceive their kids as Liberians or being from Sierra Leone or Ivory Coast, none of them thinks of them as Ghanaians”.

At some points the temporary nature of the camp also becomes apparent through withdrawal, as in the case of Oru, where the International Community and the national refugee management withdraws from the camp site, leaving only small subsidies in form of food and water rations, for those who remain on the camp site. Here both the temporary and permanent nature of the camp (and the logics under which it is produced – from the state of exception to the tensions and paradoxes worked out here) become enacted and tangible in the (his)stories of refugees returning home, only to flee from the outbreak of civil war a few years later, and return.

Also, I found a never ending enactment of temporalities (the permanent and the temporary) within both camps through the notion, practice and organization of transit and waiting in camps (waiting for hours and months, years and lifetimes). Designated areas and spaces organize these practices, while in the same moment displaying the hierarchies and power relations of who is waiting for whom. Waiting occurs though the dependencies of camp inhabitants on decision-making processes (for example on matters of housing, repatriation, distribution of food, water, materials, etc.) or bringing forth a claim, complaint or an interest. It occurs regarding the change of legal status, for example from refugee to asylum seeker, or becoming part of the group of most vulnerable people, giving access to better conditions if granted. But then the permanence of the temporality, if we might say so, is produced everywhere on and through the camp: walls and fences, streets and paths, houses and schools, concrete buildings and cement, gardens, borders, police and fire stations, recording studios, markets and squares are spatial enactments of a permanence of the camp, which stands in contrast to the
practices, signs and symbols (and indeed as well: spatial arrangements) which shall foster, organize and uphold the notion of temporality all held fast by a gate, the threshold that declares the incision by which the camps exist and persist.

Precisely because the transformation of the space of the camp into city-like structures, or indeed cities, does not accomplish necessarily a change in condition of camp inhabitants, they can still be subject to the temporary nature of the space they inhabit, enact and produce. The paradox between what is temporary and permanent is then also metaphor and expression of an ideology of organizing those on the margins, at the legal, political and spatial borders of our world. Camp inhabitants can always fall back into the trap of being exposed to the regulations, which determine a potential end (or momentary prolonging) of a lived life as it is and ought to be organized. Even if a camp can become place of identification, the home, as Jean Amery has noted at the beginning, and hence ground for becoming political subject, it can always fall back into homelessness. For example, think about the comic strip which, in the voice of the returning refugee, shall lead the camp inhabitants out of the camp (for the refugee business is soon going to end) and back into their country of origin, a space, which may, or may not be perceived as home, a space, which potentially is alien or even unknown to the returnees. This potential to organize the relationship between space and time (also enforced by and embedded in the afore
The Politics of Organizing Refugee Camps

outlined tensions and relation between humanitarianism and governance) is a means of maintaining and authorizing control and power over those who are pushed and contained on the borders of our world in "a permanent spatial arrangement, which remains outside the normal order" (Agamben, 2010: 108).

Ortung und Ordnung – order and localization

"The "ordering of space" that is, according to Schmitt, constitutive of the sovereign nomos is therefore not only a "taking of land" (Landesnahme) -- the determination of a juridical and a territorial ordering (of an Ordnung and an Ortung) -- but above all a "taking of the outside," an exception (Ausnahme). [...] the sovereign decision on the exception is the originary juridico-political structure on the basis of which what is included in the juridical order and what is excluded from it acquire their meaning. In its archetypal form, the state of exception is therefore the principle of every juridical localization, since only the state of exception opens the space in which the determination of a certain juridical order and a particular territory first becomes possible. As such, the state of exception itself is thus essentially unlocalizable (even if definite spatiotemporal limits can be assigned to it from time to time)."

(Agamben, 1998: 14f.)

The organization of migration and fleeing is first and foremost a spatial one; from the processes of fleeing itself, leaving the home mentioned before, crossing borders of villages, states and nations, using the infrastructure provided, or, if this is being occupied or unusable, finding spaces of escape beside or next to it. It entails at some point an inscription into the logics of territorialisation (and territorialisation, which comes after the fleeing), which is the inscription of the refugee into a spatial ordering, making refugees detectable and subject to means and ends of organizational
forces. This development has engendered what Agamben, in a quite breathtaking, provocative and perhaps exaggerated move of abstraction, considers to be the 'hidden matrix and nomos of the political space in which we still live' (1998: 37): a normalized state of exception that the philosopher also perceives to be underlying the camp-like forms of contemporary urban development such as gated communities or even theme parks, which ‘repeat the logic of the exception for the “winners”’ (Bülent and Laustsen, 2006: 9). Once an exceptional space, in which the life of its inmates was reduced to ‘bare life’ without value and legal status, the camp now represents a generalized topological model of inclusion through exclusion, which manifests itself in zones of indeterminacy and indifference where the conventional rule of law is at least partly or temporarily suspended. ‘We will have to admit to be facing a camp’, Agamben postulates, ‘virtually every time that such a structure is created, (...) regardless of the denomination and specific topography it might have’ (2000: 41-42). Radicalizing and spatializing Carl Schmitt’s characterization of the state of exception (and its suspension of the law) as an ‘order without localization’ (Ordnung ohne Ver-Ortung,) he diagnoses a ‘localization without order’ (Ortung ohne Ordnung) and a ‘dislocating localization’ (entortende Ordnung) (Agamben, 2000a: 44) – a proliferation of lawless and indeterminate sites that can take manifold forms and guises. In 'The Culture of Exception', Diken and Laustsen’s book-length call for sociology to face the camp, the authors go as far as claiming that ‘there is no more camp (as exception): all society today is organized according to the logic of the camp’ (2005: 7). The state of exception indeed is at the centre of the link between localization (Ortung) and ordering (Ordnung) and "contains a fundamental ambiguity, an unlocalizable zone of indistinction" (Agamben, 2000: 15).

When engaging into the discussion on the logic of the relationship between Ortung and Ordnung through the empirical material, we find, that (refugee) camps are often erected and established at the borders of spaces of our engagement, lives and action, Oru for example far away from any other major city or settlement in Nigeria, Buduburam on the coastline, connected to the capital Accra through a major highway, but still in 60 km
The camps are territorialized forms of inscribing refugees into the logics of an ordering, which is both dislocating (or, as we have seen in the previous discussion of temporality and permanence, at least always potentially of such nature) and this inscription is indeed taking place, as we have seen, so often as dislocating localizations. Only this dislocating localization in conjunction with a localization without order can account, recalling the field vignettes, for the dismissal of elected refugee representatives in situ (and with the potential of doing so in general) and for incorporating and subordinating the tasks, duties and responsibilities in and under the camp management’s office. Only through these tensions, the return of refugees to their home countries (potentially against their will) can be ordered and organized (even in light of the potential outbreak of new conflicts in their countries of origin and hence resulting in new movements of fleeing). The essence of the state of exception is embedded in the relationship between the legal possibilities and their spatial enactment, in their falling together as nomos, as we can therefore see. It is here, in this relationship, and in this space of governmentality, the space, in which the justification of the potential use of violence, to recall Lefebvre’s argument, can be justified. The processes of homogenizing, which Lefebvre again donates to these abstract spaces, to this state of exception, result in the creation of the bare life, which is exposed to the laws and spatial orderings through which it comes into being. This order is realized through a taking of space (Landnahme), one that is outside of other forms of space, on the margins and at the borders, but which is also outside of a juridical ordering. The rules whether camp inhabitants may be employed are, or can be, ever changing and refugees may or may not get a permission to earn their own money and these permissions may be granted one day and suspended

43 The same is true both for a history of camps, e.g. Nazi concentration camps, which were for the most part outside the major cities, and especially for extermination camps, which have been established in nowadays Poland, White Russia or the Baltic States. The same though is also true, for contemporary developments: Dadabb in Kenya, one of the largest refugee camps in the world, is situated in a desert like zone close to the Somalia border and especially true to contemporary developments in the European Migration policies, which exemplify both a localization without order as well as a dislocating localization through an externalization of the European border to Northern and Sub-Saharan African States and an externalization of European migration policies and an ongoing militarization of border control, as I will discuss in the concluding chapter.
These tensions account for the possibilities of the temporary and permanent and build the basis for the unifying forces of humanitarianism and governance as dominant forms and forces of organizing and producing camps. It is here, where it is being determined, whether a certain “juridical order and a particular territory become possible” and where the “zone of indistinction [...] is the presupposition of the juridical reference in the forms of its suspension”, as we have seen (Agamben, 2010: 15). The camp then is the space, where the inscription of life into an order is being executed and realized. When reflecting on the stories on the journeys of fleeing, the momentum, in which fleeing is not just a category describing forces and motives of movements, but a legal category, is movement being territorialized in the form of the camp and hence subordinated into the legal category of being a refugee or an asylum seeker. It is therefore only here and through such subordination or inscription, that the camp inhabitant is object to the “absolute impossibility of deciding between fact and law, rule and application, exception and rule” and hence a space, “in which bare life and the juridical rule enter into a threshold of indistinction” (Agamben, 2010: 111–112).
Recalling Agamben’s statement, that the zone of indistinction is the space in which bare life and juridical rule fall together – the threshold made and marked by the gate - there seems to be little hope for possibilities to resist, to create the home Amery has argued for, or to (re)claim the street, as we have heard earlier from Rancière, for the camp is the space in which the apolitical life is created – indeed, only a human being, not a citizen is found here. If the logic of the camp dis- and relocates the question of organization under and through such processes, and if it unsettles and reframes conventional notions of politics (Agamben, 2002a), then how can we think and inquire into the appearances and dynamics of resistance to proper ordering? In Agamben’s often bleak and quite totalizing diagnoses and speculations, it often seems as if there is no hope for resisting in an affirmative sense the generalized state of exception other than an equally generalized and messianic longing for political salvation in a world, “in which the citizen has been able to recognize the refugee that she or he is.” (2000: 26)

As has been argued, Agamben sticks quite close to Hannah Arendt’s (2008) notion of total domination, which does not dwell on the capacity to resist and does not afford “a mobile dimension to the static account of total domination of the camp” (Caygill, 2013: 159). More critically put, Agamben “fail[s] to offer a credible model of resistance.” (Elliott, 2011: 259) By equating politics with a Foucauldian notion of power-over-life and framing the latter as an all-encompassing historical force, Agamben constructs an ontologically resolute and rather unshakable destiny of human development, “from which”, as Rancière critically comments with a nod to Heidegger, “only a god can save us” (Rancière, 2010a: 67).44 This does not come by surprise,

---

44 The nod to Heidegger is, again, not coincidental. As has been argued, Agamben seems to conceive of the notion of the camp as an epochal destiny (Heidegger’s Geschick), which reduces human actors to a state of powerlessness and seems to leave no other alternative than a radical passivity (or “pure potentiality”) of waiting for a somewhat mystical rupture: ‘As the situation that corresponds to the camp is not subject to any empirical analysis (…) but is instead posited as a historical destiny, the eschatological “solution” to this situation can only be posed in terms of a magical shift in destinal configuration’ (Elliott, 2011: 265).
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as we have already engaged into discussion of the (im)possibilities of a political difference, which would mark and define the basis for the production of an emancipatory political, the becoming of a political subject and hence the possibilities to resist. Agamben himself acknowledges the possibilities of resistance explicitly only at one point, in which the previously discussed social figure of the Muselmann, this figure in between life and death, whose “instincts are cancelled along with his reason” (2010: 119) can no longer distinguish between the agony of the cold and the torture of the SS: And it is therefore, so Agamben argues, that the power might turn, that the guard might perceive this impossibility to differentiate as “a silent form of resistance” (Agamben, 2010: 119): 45 With Agamben only the most paradigmatic figure of the paradigm of everything, as Marchart laconically remarks, bears the possibility of resistance.

To pick up on such critique aimed at, it seems, the all-encompassing theoretical force of Auschwitz within the work of Agamben, and acknowledging the difference between refugee camps and concentration camps, the voices, notions and images from the field suggest a lived relationship between power and resistance that cannot be confined to absolutism: ambivalence is everywhere. First, whilst often referred to as “safe havens”, refugee settlements themselves manifest spatial forms of resistance to their environments’ socio-political conditions; their proliferation attests to a world of conflict and disarray which demands the construction of spaces of protection and respite from, and in opposition to, the violent forces that threaten the lives of persecuted minorities and sometimes whole populations. Indeed, in line with an ambivalent understanding of space which comes through strongly when using Lefebvre’s work to frame the empirical material, the mere existence of refugee camps in their various forms and contexts can be inscribed into complex and irreducible “knots” of resistances and counter-resistances – indeed some of these camps are of course

45 Again, this analyses of a potentiality of resistance cannot come by surprise, as we have seen, that for Agamben, the political becoming is a messianic becoming, and that this messianic hope is embedded in the state of exception as well (so the salvation is embedded in the same concept, which brings the necessity for the messianic salvation forth).
provoked by resistance movements in the first place, in this sense set up to enhance the capacity to resist the resisters.

Second, with and against Agamben’s bleak analysis of the camp and camp-like structures, we are presented with entanglements of processes of resisting and counter-resisting. In the Oru settlement the refugees resist the evacuation of the camp, defy the authorities’ decision and choose to stay in order to enforce better conditions for their return to their native country. In Buduburam, the lived space of a recording studio and the practice of music-making can be said to counter-resist the camp inhabitants’ and camp management’s resistance to take into consideration the concerns of the young, those who not receive special care and treatment of the international organizations, such as children. It takes a processual notion of resisting (Courpasson, Dany and Clegg, 2012), then, to apprehend the “reciprocal play of resistances that form clusters or sequences of resistance and counter-resistance” (Caygill, 2013: 5). These suggest a fundamentally ambivalent understanding of such processes of resisting, which cuts across taken-for-granted divisions of oppression and defiance, and which thus need to be traced in their situational unfolding.

Third, such processes of resisting do not necessarily exhaust themselves in ‘mere’ opposition to power and domination but can develop a productive, affirmative force. The most striking example in this sense may be Samuel Morgen’s recording studio. It stands in sharp contrast to the architectural and infrastructural facilities, which are meant to serve the camp inhabitants’ needs. It provides an inviting atmosphere of openness. What is produced, then, is not only Hip-Hop CDs and cassettes. The studio manifests and responds to a concern, which finds no other means of being voiced. To put it differently, not only is a matter of concern made manifest and visible, also further means of expression and circulation are provided. The same holds true for the case of the woman at the women empowerment schools; who instead of (re)producing the space as a mere site of learning and preparation for commodification, twist through their practices, their lived lives the logics into a space, in which again, unheard voices are being heard
and where a space is being created, in which there is full "command of the
dialectics of knowledge and recognition, of trust and confidence. Since we
know them, we recognize them and we trust ourselves to speak and act – for
we may have justified confidence in our knowledge and recognition" to recall
Amery.

And perhaps, then, it makes more sense to present the (abstract,
topological) notion of the camp as one that seeks to resist and extinguish the
capacity to resist, a continuous struggle in which it, even in the direst of
circumstances, does not succeed (Martí and Fernández, 2013). In order to
apprehend the "knot" of resisting and counter-resisting and its productive
traces, the fieldwork suggests that we need to engage closely with the very
spatialities of resistance: The UNCHR building fallen into ruin and the kept-up
houses and lively scenes behind it; the studio, tiny and hot and yet open
and welcoming, less bound to hierarchy and order and hence enabling other
forms of the political than the buildings designated to serve the camp
inhabitants, the signs and symbols posted on walls and the lived scenes
within houses, which may become home and hence basis for the becoming
of a subject, who can speak or act. There is a spatial formation of capacities
to resist, which is at work in the making and unmaking of the camps.
Processes of resisting are deeply embedded and play out in the production
of organizational spaces and their conceived, embodied and affective
configurations (Beyes & Steyaert, 2013). Refugee settlements are then sites
designed to resist the effects of the socio-political conditions that provoke
them. The figures of the refugee and of bare life resist classic distinctions
between human being and citizen as well as state, nation (nativity) and
territory (Agamben, 2002a). As social form, the logic of the camp resists our
conventional understanding of organization, and of where and how processes
of resistance take place. And the vignettes and the field work as well as the
tentative deliberations on the notion of resistance suggest that the everyday
enactment of such "safe havens" is itself entangled in processes of resisting.
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Weltanschauungen: Order and Disorder

“The oil derricks and the thirsty gardens of Los Angeles
and the ravines of California at evening and the fruit market
did not leave the messenger of misfortune unmoved."
(Bertolt Brecht, 1997/1943: 345 - 355)

This excerpt, the ending, of Bertolt Brecht’s poem “Landschaft des Exils” (“Landscape of exile”) carries an autobiographic undertone: Fleeing from the Nazi Regime in Germany through Europe and finally arriving in the United States, in Los Angeles, occupies the refugee with the notion of her being the messenger of misfortune. It is she who brings news from a world which is outside the one who is reaching. And this outside is indeed a spatial one first and foremost: it is one which has been reached by war and devastation, hunger and poverty, terror and imprisonment, trauma and suffering. Recalling my methodological reflections, the refugee then shares certain ontological inscriptions with the theorist in the original meaning of the word: It is she, who has seen and witnessed, aesthetically experienced (to a high price) and now comes to bear witness. But, unlike the theorist, she is not returning to his polis, to her home, but comes to another one and brings with her the message of misfortune. This message does not need to be written or declared: it is present through her presence; the messenger is the message. And like another messenger, Plato’s prisoner who escapes the cave, his story of the other world behind ours shall not be heard: Potentially, as Agamben suggest, because he is a reminder, that “we are all virtually homines sacri” and are now faced with those who actually are (2010: 75), potentially, because he presents a disturbance to the (seemingly) order under and in which we live.

The refugee then is the one, who is made responsible for the message she delivers (and not the causes of the messages), even more so, since the message only needs her presence. Whereas the movement and the arrival of the messenger of disorder cannot be controlled (even though the attempts to gain control, to regulate and govern this movement are becoming ever
more intense), the refugee can be contained, by inscribing her into the space of the camp and its logics. Remember how Zygmunt Baumann refers to refugees as the embodiment of the collapse of an order, they show us, and remind us, what we would like to forget: that there are mysterious, dark, global forces, which are strong enough to also to influence and change our lives; they remind us of our endemic fragility of our luck (2016).

The refugee camp then turns into a space in which an order of our worlds contains the disorder being brought through the refugee. A space, which entails and keeps the stories of fleeing and the reasons and causes for fleeing, which hides the fate and message of the individual behind the subordination of the juridical process producing the bare life, which then is stripped of its possibilities to speak and act on behalf and through the experiences, which seem far away from us, but may reach us. If the spatial form of the camp calls for perceiving organization as a threshold ‘where people routinely pass from order into disorder and from disorder into order’, to recall ten Bos´ argument (2005: 18), and if we depart from an open-ended and invariably preliminary understanding of resistance as outlined above, then empirically facing the camp and apprehending its threshold of organizing should yield further insights into the possibility and enactments of processes of resisting, namely that the resistance we have encountered before, may be resistance of those, who give testimony and bear witness, by making themselves heard and seen, felt and noticed. The notion of the camp as a threshold, in which people pass from order into disorder may then be in the same reading twisted, as a space, in which the disorder of our worlds becomes subject to an order, which indeed is the state of exception, hence a space, in which the law may be suspended at any time. And following this thought, we may understand the refugee camp as an externalization of the disorder of our world, a disorder that allows for the creation of spaces which stand emblematic for our world through their production between humanitarianism and governance, temporality and permanence, localization and order, between power and resistance, order and disorder.

To paraphrase the surrealist poet Louis Aragon’s remark on Jean Luc
Godard’s film 'Pierrot le Fou': Potentially, the refugee’s madness is only here to throw the shocking order of desire [and affirmation] into our disordered times.
“The passport is the most noble part of the human being. It also does not come into existence in such a simple fashion as a human being does. A human being can come into the world anywhere, in the most careless way and for no good reason, but a passport never can. When it is good, the passport is also recognized for this quality, whereas a human being, no matter how good, can go unrecognized.”

(Brecht, 1997/1940: 9)

Brecht’s famous lines on the difference between the passport and the human being mirror the reflections and thoughts developed above: The inscription of humans into the logics of the camp is depended on the quality of the passport, whereas the human may be indeed organized to and at the margins of our world, outside and inscribed into the logics of a state of exception. How then to think the possibilities of politics along these notions?

The vignettes and the photos, the interviews and observation, the material drawn from the fieldwork, can be inscribed into Agamben’s topological considerations of the camp. However, they also form very different organizational spaces and manifest heterogeneous entanglements of processes of resisting and counter-resisting, of the political difference.

Taken together, the field work attests to the need to work with an unstable and generic notion of the becoming and the consequences of the political difference, a difference that accommodates its conceptually immanent ‘counter-movement to both unification and dispersal’, to quote Caygill (2013: 7). To more systematically coax out the implications for the study of other spaces of organizing, namely the spatial production of refugee camps, I will try to discuss the notion of paradoxes in relation to the conceptual deliberations on the political difference outlined above, more closely.

First and indeed camps manifest zones of indistinction “where the dividing line between citizen and outlaw, legality and illegality, law and violence, and ultimately life and death are (...) blurred” (Downey, 2009: 112).
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The heterogeneous groups of refugees in the Oru and Buduburam Refugee Settlements have a common denominator in terms of their legal and political status: they are indeed bare life, confronted with a situation where the conventional rule of law is at least partly suspended. All settlements are thus spatial manifestations of the state of exception. While the respective topographical set-up of these spaces may differ, they embody the very same logic (Agamben, 2002a: 183). They present *Centers of Temporary Permanence* as the artist Adrian Paci has called them in his work on *Immigration Removal Centre* (Downey, 2009: 122). The state of exception emerges from the collapse of the dialectic relation between law and politics, since “under the exception-as-the rule, politics does not require law to legitimate itself” (Huysmans, 2008: 174). We can observe this suspension of the law through the closing of the camp at Oru, and the subsequent attempts to move the refugees to alternative settlements or towards an uncertain fate of repatriation. These are acts of spatial power rendering, or acting upon, naked life outside of legally bound procedures or based on the inherent possibility of suspending a jurisdictional framework at any given point in time.

As the argument by Agamben is built mainly on the case of Nazi concentration camps, I have pointed out that this suspension of the law has never been as obvious as in the cases of, for instance, Auschwitz, Buchenwald and Dachau. However, even these camps’ actual configurations were quite different from one another and led to different forms of organization and possibilities to survive (Kogon, 1974; Sofsky, 2008). In his defence, Agamben’s point is not, then, to equate the factual monstrosity of, say, Auschwitz with contemporary refugee settlements, let alone gated communities. The camp stands for a generalized topological model (of inclusion through exclusion, of a zone of indeterminacy and indifference, of the state of exception), and it is the metamorphoses and perhaps proliferation of this structure – not as exceptions but as exemplifications of a disturbingly constituent element of power and politics – that he asks us to face (Agamben, 2008). As the camps I studied reveal, we are thus encountering a generalized, topological form of organization. It in itself it can
be said to resist and displace the common understanding of organizations as legal entities in a bounded and clearly demarcated sense. Correspondingly, the study of ‘darker’ forms, means and spaces of organizing needs to open up to spaces of organizing as thresholds between order and disorder where prior distinctions between organizational boundaries, included and excluded as well as work and non-work do not hold (ten Bos, 2005). Hence the symbolic importance of the camp gate.

By facing the refugee camp, then, we encounter a space of organization, which complicates our understanding of politics as invariably at work in the making of organizational space. Facing the camp and its knot of politics and the political thus calls for organizational geographies of how processes of producing spaces of organizing exclusion take place.

This affirmative force of invariably situated and context-bound processes of resisting both supplements and problematizes Agamben’s analysis. The latter risks endorsing a depoliticized stance in that it conceives of the governing of bare life as fundamentally unpolitical (Agamben, 2002a). It “erases from the concept of politics a rich and constitutive history of socio-political struggles, traditions of thought linked to this history, and key-sites and temporalities of politics as well as the central processes through which individualized bodily resistance gain their sociopolitical significance.” (Huysmans, 2008: 177) In this sense, the occupied camp at Oru for example takes on an allegorical quality not only with regard to the dangers that a “safe haven” can become afflicted by, but also in relation to Agamben’s argument itself, which leaves the camp empty of traces of the political (Marchart, 2010: 228).

In sum, these phenomena and possibilities of the production of organizational spaces hint at the ambivalent constitution of (not only) refugee camps, which are fragile as well as manifest, provisional and possibly everlasting, spaces of resistance and resisted spaces, spaces between temporality and permanence, between Ordnung and Ortung, produced and producing. They are espoused as a non-political, strictly humanitarian space while they are politically charged in and through their everyday enactments.
They can be interpreted as highly policed spaces of exception, which produce and govern naked life, while they teem with 'life' and spatial reconfigurations of what can be expressed, perceived and done. As thresholds between order and disorder, they continuously open and close the possibilities of the political difference. Amid all this dissensus the camp is to be examined as a social form, and the logic of the camp as an 'organizing principle' of social life (Diken and Laustsen, 2006: 8). While Agamben's thinking has so far been largely neglected in the study of organization, Banerjee notion of necrocapitalism draws upon the philosopher's *homo sacer* project to show how contemporary 'practices of organizational accumulation (...) involve violence, dispossession, and death' (2008: 1543). As stated before, in a more in-depth discussion of Agamben's work in relation to organizational thought, ten Bos (2005) points out that we are faced with an idea of organization that fundamentally resists and destabilizes conventional notions and sites of organizing: "The truth about who we are cannot be found in organized and well-ordered places, or more precisely, we cannot understand human nature if we do not understand that the symbols of our order – civility, law, organization, and so on – in fact refer to a threshold between order and disorder, a threshold that we are all sooner or later destined to pass" (ten Bos, 2005: 19).

Against the background of this threshold, I have tried to develop an understanding of refugee camps as paradoxical sites of organizing, as ambivalent, processual and spatial phenomenon. On this basis, linking the pressing socio-political concern of refugee settlements to Agamben's notion of the logic of the camp as a paradigm of social organization, takes into account the study to the politics of contemporary forces of organizing as well as the possibilities of an emancipatory political momentum embedded herein, hence answering the call to supplement Agamben-inspired, topological reflections on the proliferation of states of exceptions with on-the-ground explorations – organizational geographies – of how the logic of the camp is enacted and how such enactment may talk back and give voice to the processes which produce and are produced by a different political subject from within. These thoughts may hardly be able to do justice to the
complexities of camp life and the lives lived in camps. In this sense, they continue far beyond these and will keep on doing so – they do what practices of resistance often do, continuing by reinventing themselves (Caygill, 2013: 6).

As the discussion of the vignettes and the field work on the basis of the conceptual deliberations shows, studies of the production of space and of refugee camps need to be supplemented with a resolutely processual, socio-spatial and affirmative understanding of the political, which needs to be traced in its situational enactments. This understanding of the becoming of a political subject, which indeed can speak up against the police and act against the dominant forms of the society it finds itself in, cannot be tied to workplace relations but should reach out to, for instance, the often bleak realities of refugee settlements and the itself resisted production of the spaces of bare life. Here, conventional distinctions between work and non-work or assumptions of legal entities and the micropolitics of established organizational actors or the institutional politics and legal frameworks, which are open to Western citizens are suspended. This is not to say, that the becoming of a political subject, of organizing the means and end of politics and the political is embedded within the production of refugee camps (and other organizations) sine qua non. Instead, we also have to acknowledge “the furious resistance against being addressed as a subject wanting emancipation” as Jan Verwoert (2013) fittingly puts it. This then is yet another argument for an open-ended understanding of processes of the becoming of political subject, as they are, in Rosa Luxemburg’s words, a “ceaselessly moving sea of phenomena” (1971: 182). Mapping organizational geographies of the political difference implies accommodating (and not silencing) their ambivalent and paradoxical enactments.

Such organizational geographies then ought to be embedded in the study of spaces such as camp, but are not exclusively confined to them: As Diken and Laustsen have argued, such studies can for example turn to the ‘festival’ or ‘carnival’ life, which is organized in cities or entire areas (such as Party Islands), cruises or specific temporal organizations – spaces and
organizations that function indeed through a suspension of rules (2005: 116). It should be noted here, that, for example, there are hidden links between “the biopolitics of totalitarianism (abandonment to violence and death) and mass hedonism (abandonment to sun, sea, sex and drugs)” (Diken & Laustsen, 2005: 113).

In more general terms, organizational geographies within the field of organization studies could turn to temporal organizations per se: Organizations, which function through and with mobility on the one hand, hence forms of organizing, which produce paradoxes of temporality and permanence. Parker, for example, has mentioned, amongst others, mobile libraries, sport teams visiting specific venues or travelling productions such as theatre companies and the circus, of course (2011: 556). Beyes & Steyeart (2013) have turned to artistic interventions in public spaces, which produce affectual and atmospheric disruptions of spatial and social orderings, which can be read as enactments producing paradoxes between Ortung and Ordnung as well as order and disorder. Then again, such studies on camps could more broadly contribute to investigations, which attempt to “illuminate the various ways in which institutions come to silence, exclude or disavow feelings, practices, groups or discourses […]” (Rizq: 2013: 1281). Such studies could then turn towards the seemingly normal organization and investigate, amongst others specific, managerial tools and means for example New Public Management “strategies of accountability and control” (Rizq, 2013: 1286) or specific sites and fields, such as health service (Rizq, 2013) or bureaucracies denying the emotional dimension of decision making processes (Linstead, 1997).

And then such organizational geographies could enrich our understanding of the seemingly normal and the darker side of organizations, hinting both at the threshold and the fluidity between the two in a double sense: Firstly, as with regard to the similarities and parallels of managerial practices we encounter in both and to which I have nodded above. Secondly, as with regard to the forms and transformations, through and in which the darker sites are indeed entering and shaping our daily lives, therefore
becoming paradigmatic for the organization of nowadays (refugee) politics (Jakob & Schlindwein, 2017).

The understanding of the production of refugee camps and its ramifications, both as with regard to the dominant forces producing them and resisting forces, which are produced by them, which has been outlined here, might thus help to interrogatively envision and apprehend resistant forms of organizing which are usually disavowed in organizational analysis. For this, the fundamental ambivalence, the confusion that is caused through its productions and producing effects, the contingent foundation on which a discussion of the politics of organizing refugee camps is built, needs to be acknowledged and worked with. It is only within such understanding of politics, that one can both detect and understand the governing forces of the sovereign, which is responsible for the creation and the upholding the state of exception, an abstract space, rendering homogeneity on the one hand, and on the other is able to determine the possibilities of another form of political uprising, one that speaks against and formulates both political claim and identity, one that may leave us on the hopeful idea, that at the end of the day, “a new population may be formed out of all this confusion” (Agier, 2008: 10).
8 Epilogue, or: Athens, 468 BC

The Theatre of the Dionysus, the first theatre building in the world, or at least, the first one known and the remaining, situated on the south slope and at the foot of the Acropolis in Athens.

“Zeus! Lord and guard of suppliant hand
Look down bening on us who carve
Thine aid-whom winds and waters drave
From where, through drifting shiftin sands,
Puors Nilus to the wave.
From where the Green land, god-possest,
Closes and fronts the Syrian waste,
We flee as exiles, yet unbanned
By murder´s sentence from our land;
But since Aegyptus had decreed
His sons should wed his brother´s seed,
Ourselves we tore from bonds abhorred,
From wedlock not of heart but hand,
Nor brooked to call a kinsman lord!”

(Aeschylus, 1908/468BC: 1)
I am returning, at the end, to the beginning. There is a stage again and a play is being performed, but we are leaving Munich and entering Athens, a capital at the margins and yet at the centre of Europe, and recalling the situating of the thesis in Chapter 2, a contemporary site, where the political and hence spatial struggles on questions of refugee policies are carried out.

Aeschylus' play 'The Suppliants' premiered to our knowledge earliest or after 486 BC at the theatre of the Dionysus in Athens: The Danaids, the 50 daughters of Danaus flee from forced marriage to their Egyptian cousins into the walls of the city of Argos. The king of Argos, Pelasgus, is confronted with the dilemma of either facing a potential war over the refugees, or, while denying the right to the city and refuge to the Danaids, bring forth the judgment and the wrath of Zeus. The people of Argos decide to give refuge to the daughters and at the end of the play, they walk behind the walls of the city, safe for the moment, potentially facing, just as the demos, which welcomes them, a future threat: "Of the two evils, the wrath of Zeus is judged the worse. The demos votes for giving protection. Abiding by this vote, the city faces the likelihood of war" (Diamantopoulos, 1957 : 224). The end of the play hence consists of a cliff hanger, it is, rather, an opening than a closure. Aeschylus' play, the least known of the seven dramas of the author which we are aware of, is part of the tetralogy of the so called Danaids-Plays and has for a long time been perceived and understood as one of his, if not the, earliest one. This misperception originates in its conceptualization: We know from Aristotle, that the tragedy has invented itself out of and from the singing of the chorus. Based on this understanding, there is something uniquely alien and strange about the suppliants which indeed, (as a small piece of papyrus indicates, which was found only in 1953) cannot have premiered before 468 BC: The play doesn't open with a monologue of one of the actors of a dialogue between two of them, but it begins with the entrance of the chorus: "Zeus! Lord and guard of suppliant hand, look down bening us who carve..." (Aeschylus, 1908/468BC: 1). The chorus in the "the
Suppliants” is of double nature: On the one hand, it is the chorus, through which the poet talks to the people, the narrating voice which guides the audience and gives witness to the reasoning and feelings of the characters, on the other hand the 50 daughters of Danaus, and this shall be emphasized here, are the main character, the dramatis personae, the subject which is the force, which carries and shapes the drama themselves. Aeschylus has used an old myth as the basis for his tetralogy, consisting of “The Suppliants”, “The Egyptians” and “The Danaids” (with the latter two following the suppliants and bringing the drama to an end) on the myth and the saga of the daughters of the Danaus: From what is known to us – from Aeschylus himself, from Hesiod and from Hekataois of Milet before him, and later on, in manifold forms for example from Ovid – in most of these reflections, narrations and critiques, the story is based on, and finds the basis of its conflict in the brotherly struggle between Danaus and Aigyptos – the two brothers, one the father of the 50 daughters, one the father of the 50 sons, which ought to be married, fight over, and this depends on the narrations we find, power, or glory, they envy each other and wish either for the death of the respective other one, or the death of his offspring’s through the hands of their own (the stories of marriage and betrayal, death and disobedience and the fulfilling of the oracles prediction, that Danaus would die from the hand of one of his sons in law are then outlaid in and described in the “The Egyptians” and “the Danaids”). Aeschylus now has twisted this narration in an utmost different way, which is exemplified through its poetic expression in the opening of the play through the chorus.

The brotherly conflict is practically excluded from “The Suppliants”, the oracle’s prediction does not play that much of a role. Instead, the chorus, those seeking refuge, appear as political subjects - the fleeing is not embedded in their fathers wish not to marry their Egyptian cousins, but is their own motive: The Danaids are not fleeing to fulfil their father’s wish not to get married, but the poet dared, what has been his intention and makes the “Suppliants” an upmost modern and contemporary play: the action of the virgins is an autonomous motive in itself, it is their voice, which says “no” and it is their action, which is born out of a notion and a motive of resistance
(against forced marriage and male desire) which is the basis for them becoming political subject and the manifestation of a political rupture in itself. The “Suppliants” hence, is not only the play in which for the first time questions of exile and fleeing, migration and asylum and in this context, the laws of the gods and the laws of men are being negotiated and narrated, but also the first play in which deliberately the rights of women are under discussion. The rights of woman though, which are not discussed as object of male politics, desire, needs or principles, but woman rights which are born out of an autonomous, independent and sovereign decision making, an emancipatory project in itself. We may situate this autonomous motive in our discussion on the postfoundational political thought, as a contingent foundation avant la lettre, as the political momentum in the structure of politics. And indeed, we can detect and translate motives and decisions, politics and the political, first and foremost spaces of the “Suppliants” in our previous discussion, or, put differently, understand the former through the latter: In the light of our discussion of the social figure of the refugee, we see that the Danaids resists being subsumed as victims (of male law and rule, for example) or as entrepreneurial figures (they do bring the order into an disorder), they produce and entail the paradoxes we have been discussing before: the question of temporality and permanence remains unresolved, but is clearly present in the open end of the play, their fleeing is, and their arrival reminds of us of, the dislocating localization, and much of the conflict in the city of Argos resolves around this topic, that indeed the Danaids can be localized, where they shall not be localized and yet need to be. In this light, both the question of a disorder which is brought into a world of order as much as the inner conflict between humanitarianism and governance, are at the heart of the discussion and decision-making between the demos, the people of Argos, who vote in favour of help and refuge and their king Pelasgus, who sees and fears the uncertain future of his city potentially facing war and disorder.

We are urged to think about Arendt’s notion, that human rights are indeed those rights which are granted only to those who have no other rights and are left with nothing but being human, when we reflect on the conflict of
the laws of the city and the laws of the God (only: the organizational force of refugee camps, the management of those on the borders, at the margins and on the outside, in Buduburam and Oru, in Lampedusa and Lesbos, in Dadabb and Lybia do not have to fear the wrath of Zeus) and we see the paradoxes of an a-political treatment of refugees (indeed, the Danaids, those who are only refugees and have not right to the city, on which it is decided, and hence have no civic rights and no final say in the decision on their fate), and see yet the politics these entail. In this understanding, the Danaids are the naked life, the homo sacer and yet, through this, bring the potential of emancipating themselves from such state and inscription. The city of Argos then indeed is a nomos, a space and a rule of law, which, even though as site of action in the Suppliants more than 2500 years old, is emblematic and a symbol of our modernity and the world we live in. And this city also is a complex space, an abstract space potentially, as Lefebvre would put it, a space rendering homogeneity (peace and order, a dominant space of society, a space of the rule of law) and then, at the very same time, a space which is heterogeneous, a space in and through which different spaces are enacted and live, producing and being produced and we may understand the notion of the nomos as both spatial and juridical and the legal conflict between the laws of the city and the laws of the gods through the constant (and indeed unresolved) struggle and interdependencies of a multiplicity of spaces within one, of the falling together of conceived, perceived and lived spaces.

We shall not overstretch the analogies of the “The Suppliants” to the contemporary organization of refugees and of refugee camps in our societies and there are differences, which indeed are well worth noting (and may present sources of reflection on present day politics); few cities open their borders (as do few states) and the demos, it seems, nowadays often (even though not exclusively) votes in favour of the law of the city and against the law of the gods (not only the managers of refugees as I mentioned, but also the people do not fear the wrath of Zeus any more). Refugee camps indeed then are different spaces than the city of Argos and if the legalization of staying and remaining and the organization of this stay is being granted and exercised, this is happening outside the city walls, often out of sight and
sound (and this is a development, which we can see, for example, in the ongoing militarization, transformation and externalization of border policies and borders as such – to a discussion of which, I will return later). But we are indeed able to conclude at this point: Aeschylus organizes his play differently (so different indeed that it has for ages been situated wrongly) and he does not do so in order to silence a conflict, but to bring forth a different voice which is narrating and driving it, a different voice, which is, through the play actions inherent to such, becoming a political subject, altering not only itself (and its destiny), but also its surroundings, the roles and possibilities of its perpetrators and its helpers. And these politics of organizing refugees are at the heart of play, which 2500 years ago premiered and which indeed premiered at a space, which, today is symbol and sight of those developments, in and through which I have situated this thesis at the beginning of this text. Therefore, we may open this situating and the temporality of this text through Aeschylus, without denying or neglecting the arguments and present day developments, which are both the basis for the empirical material and the theoretical reasoning. This thesis then is also situated in a debate, which already took place 463 BC on the southern slopes of the Acropolis and we may learn from this point of the debate, that indeed an opening towards the end, and not a concluding statement, is a necessity, if we are to understand those who seek refuge not only as those to whom human rights (and only those) may be granted, but indeed understand them (and hence us) as political subjects, with motives and desires, arguments, and as emancipatory characters. And in this light, we shall also read and understand the attempts to silence this potential, to organize this potential struggle, which is brought forth through refugee and the disorder to out ordered world, through forms of containment and spaces, which (may) silence and confine the struggles and possibilities of politics.

The reason for us to still be able to detect those struggles and possibilities are not situated within a purely theoretical reading and understanding of refugees and the organization of refugee camps, but are entailed in the everyday production of refugee camps and the heterogeneity and messiness of everyday practices, from the women of Buduburam, to the
use of music and festivals to the occupation of camps and the flyers and
texts hinting at other, different spaces and practices. Returning yet again to
the other play, which has introduced us to the discussion of the possibilities
of politics and the organization of refugee camps, Castorf’s "Reise ans Ende
der Nacht" and the stage design, we can see those cracks in the ordering and
the attempt to render homogeneity through the space of the camp in the
history of the real Auschwitz pole and sign, which did read “Arbeit macht
Frei". Jan Liwacz, the polish blacksmith, a Auschwitz concentration camp
prisoner, who was forced to forge the swung the letters, turned the letter B in
the word ‘Arbeit’ upside down as a sign and symbol of protest and
resistance. This may only seem to be a small symbolic step in light of the
circumstances, the surrounding and the horrors of the Shoah. But this small
step is one, which lifts the production of the homo sacer, as Agamben would
argue, out of the apolitical life it is being inscribed into.

It is in this light, that the organization of refugee camps also needs to
be understood. They are indeed spaces, in which help is being offered, food
is being supplied and housing organized. But they are also spaces, which
create an anonymous mass of people, pushed to the margins ad controlled
and contained. Camp inhabitants are in this sense, just as Simmel’s stranger,
“near and far at the same time”, indeed then a figure who’s arrival today
leads to the organization of his stay tomorrow (Simmel: 1908/1921: 326).

Indeed, the "camp is the space, which opens up when the state of
exception becomes the rule" as Agamben notes (2000a: 38) and we see
this in Aeschylus' 'The Suppliants', as well as in the cases of Buduburam and
Oru; it is through this, that the organization of the stay of the refugee can be
organized. When returning to Agier’s central arguments, which centre
around his work on the management of those on the margins, the
undesirables, as I have outlined in chapter 2, camps then indeed become the
space, in and through which humanitarian action creates an impossibility of
the becoming of political subjects, situating humanitarian efforts within and
at the forefront of a macro-political frame of controlling the movement of
population and people. The camp then, is one of the means and ends of
such controlling efforts, in line with further attempts to militarize border
controls and externalize the borders themselves (Jakob & Schlindwein, 2017)
and it is the form, which can be spatially best located. In this then lies, as I
have shown, also a possibility: “It is again from the camps that we can see
the emergence of tactics, strategies and mobilizations that jam the
apparatus and disturb its programmed orders” as Agier denotes (2011: 212).
It is in this inner contradiction of the organization of refugee camps, an
unavoidable and embedded one, that one can find hope and traces of
emancipation: Firstly in the movement of people itself (the coming of the
stranger today as Simmel would put it), secondly in movement, which
(self)organized within the organization of the camp in which they stay today:
Acknowledging, as Aeschylus did more than 2500 years ago and as Jelinek
translated into the present situation of forced migration at the beginning of
this decade, that one part of the world is not just organizing and anonymous
mass of victims, but political subjects, whose fleeing is an emancipatory
political act may be a first start to find a different understanding of the
political (im)possibilities which are embedded in movement and fleeing avant
la lettre. In the case of the camp this means not only to acknowledge the
inherent contradictions and ruptures, nor does it exclusively mean to make
them fruitful for camp inhabitants: It rather means that embedded in the
most dire circumstances, on the outside of all places, on the margins of the
world, in a space, which indeed produces and inscribes naked life, in spaces
of assistance, control and confinement, inhabitants of such spaces find ways
to lift themselves out, in the Agambian sense, as form-of-life, as political
subject. Space then is not only the central category, through which naked life
is being produced, but also the central category, through which this life can
turn the inscription into an order, into an emancipatory momentum out of
such.
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